Class 234.4 J Book F112
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

From the estate of
~~PRESENTED BY~~
Rev. George B. Johnson

E Lib: Soc: S: Joh: Ev.

Rev. S. R. Johnson.

THE PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION:

SOUGHT FOR IN HOLY SCRIPTURE;

AND

INVESTIGATED THROUGH THE MEDIUM

OF

THE WRITTEN DOCUMENTS

OF ECCLESIASTICAL ANTIQUITY.

BY

GEORGE STANLEY FABER, B.D.

MASTER OF SHERBURN HOSPITAL, AND PREBENDARY OF SALISBURY.

Ἀγαπητοί, ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους· ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστι, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ γεγέννηται, καὶ γινώσκει τὸν Θεόν. Ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν, οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν Θεόν, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστιν. 1 Joan. iv. 7, 8.

Qui habent charitatem, nati sunt ex Deo: qui non habent, non nati sunt ex Deo. August. in 1 Epist. Joan. Tractat. v. Oper. vol. ix. p. 220.

Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω. Concil. Nic. I. can. 6.

PUBLISHED BY R. B. SEELEY AND W. BURNSIDE:
AND SOLD BY L. AND G. SEELEY,
FLEET STREET, LONDON.
MDCCCXL.

234.4 J
F112

63286

PRINTED BY L. AND G. SEELEY, THAMES DITTON, SURREY.

CONCORDIA SEMINARY
LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MO.

DEDICATION.

TO THE

REV. L. VERNON HARCOURT, A. M.

CHANCELLOR OF YORK.

My dear Sir,

Agreeably to its title, the Work on the *Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration*, which I here beg leave to inscribe to you, is not to be viewed as *controversial*, inasmuch as it is altogether *investigatory*. It contains an historical inquiry into a FACT: the FACT, to wit, of *The Particular System of Doctrine, maintained as the apostolically received mind of Scripture, on the part of the Early Church, relative to the more or less intimate connection of Outward Baptism and Inward Moral Regeneration.*

If I may speak individually, I have long been of opinion: that the only tangible mode of settling disputes, in regard to the Interpretation of Scripture, is by an appeal, where an appeal is feasible, to the Testimony of the Primitive Church from the beginning.

This process, which is entirely a process of collecting evidence, can scarcely, in any legitimate sense of the word, be called *controversial*. For, in truth, when the evidence to the FACT has been collected and exhibited, perfect freedom of choice will still remain with the reader: that is to say, he will still be quite at liberty to choose, between the ascertained Testimony of the Primitive Church on the one hand, and any opposing Doctrine inculcated through the medium of insulated Private Judgement on the other hand.

I am quite aware, that, in the present day, many persons, on doctrinal subjects, deem their own opinions, or the opinions of some

favourite influential writer or (it may be) preacher, far more valuable and far more rationally binding, than the recorded Testimonies of the Church, which, either immediately or almost immediately, conversed with the Apostles. This indefinite and unsubstantiated principle of Scripture Interpretation, which some would represent as the glory of the Reformation, you are, I well know, as little able to digest as myself. Its votaries I readily leave in the full enjoyment of their favourite Scheme of Biblical Exposition, whether it be wise or unwise, sound or unsound, safe or unsafe. *Quisque suos patimur manes:* and the contending parties, which such a Scheme inevitably produces, I sincerely hope, may be enabled to go on with the poet, in hereafter saying; *Exinde per amplum mittimur Elysium.* But, at all events, whether acceptable or unacceptable to independent and therefore (I should suppose) unauthoritative modern speculatists, there can be no great harm in exhibiting the Testimony of the Early Church, in respect to

the amount of Connection which Scripture (it was believed) teaches to subsist in the case of Outward Baptism and Inward Moral Regeneration. This I have done with what care I could: and I am not without hope, that the effort may be attended with some benefit.

You yourself have largely quoted from the ancient ecclesiastical writers: and most fully do I accord with you in the evidential principle, which you have so soundly and so judiciously laid down. It may perhaps, therefore, occasion some degree of surprize, that we have not been brought exactly to the same conclusion: and this very circumstance may peradventure be urged as a proof of the small utility of an appeal to Antiquity. Such an allegation, however, would be nugatory. Several of the passages, cited by yourself, I had already put down in writing before I had perused your interesting and valuable Work on the Deluge: and I readily own, that, if no other passages of a different tendency occurred

in the old Fathers, your conclusion would be legitimate. But the fact is: that there are various other passages of an explanatory nature, which seem to have escaped your observation. The abduction of these, and their combination with such as those which you have produced, have brought me to a result not altogether the same as your own. Whether you will allow the validity of my inference from them, I will not undertake anteriorly to determine. The passages in question are duly and faithfully exhibited: and, if you deem them insufficient, I am quite assured that any difference of opinion will produce no difference of mutual good feeling and regard. The grand difficulty, in the way both of *argument* and of *evidence*, is the case of Infant-Baptism. So far as *argument* is concerned, we may resolve the matter into the well known Coverley adage, that *Much may be said on both sides:* and, so far as *evidence* is concerned, we are compelled mainly to depend upon the comparatively late testimony of Au-

gustine. Yet his testimony is of prime value and importance: because he delivers it, not as his own mere private unsupported opinion, but as the familiar and universal testimony of the Church from the beginning; a testimony, he remarks, which we are bound in reason to admit on the score of antiquity and universality, though no specific decision of a Council can be alleged for its historical substantiation.

Our once frequent personal intercourse is now cut off by your final removal into Sussex: but I cannot easily forget the pleasure and the benefit, which I derived from it when we were neighbours. Conversation with the pen remains, however, when conversation with the tongue, save at wide intervals, has ceased: and, in prefixing to this Work the name of the author of *The Doctrine of the Deluge*, I cannot deny myself a gratification which is closely associated with old recollections of sincere regard and respect; would that I could also say, recollections unattended with regret

both for your removal from Stokesley and for its cause. That the more genial climate, and the greater medical conveniences, of the South of England, may, through God's blessing, be attended with the best effects, is, my dear Sir, the hearty wish and prayer of your obliged friend and servant,

G. S. FABER.

Sherburn-House,
April 8, 1839.

PREFACE.

It is certainly both encouraging to myself, and indicative that the mode of proof adopted in this Treatise meets with at least *some* measure of acceptation: that, as *one* Brother in the Christian Ministry, personally unknown to me, should have expressed by letter a wish to see the *Primitive Doctrine of Justification* evidentially settled and established from the attestation of the Early Church; so *another* Brother in the Christian Ministry, equally unknown to me by person, should have similarly, by letter, requested me to ascertain, if by Documentary Testimony it could be ascertained, the *Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration.*

I. More than twenty years ago, I had, to the best of my judgment and knowledge, discussed, in four successive Sermons, the *Doctrine of Rege-*

neration according to Scripture and the Church of England *. But, agreeably to their title, I meddled not with the *Evidence afforded by Primitive Antiquity.*

Here, so far as respects a thorough investigation of the Doctrine itself, the Sermons were indisputably defective. They wanted that, which, in litigated matters of Theology, affords the sole tangibly authoritative interpretation of Holy Scripture: for they wanted that, without which, *one* man's Opinion, when delivered merely in the way of his own Insulated and Unsupported Private Judgment, is, abstractedly, quite as good as *another* man's Opinion.

With great reason, my Clerical Brother, I suppose, saw and felt this palpable evidential defect. In the present Treatise, I have endeavoured to supply it.

Respecting the ancient Doctrine of Regeneration as held and taught in the Primitive Church, my own mind has long been satisfied with the evidence, which fell in my way, while, for very different purposes, I was examining the venerable

* See my Sermons on Various Subjects. vol. i. serm. 5, 6, 7, 8.

Ecclesiastical Documents of the early ages. But I much doubt, whether I should ever have fairly sat down to write a regular Treatise on the subject, if I had not been stimulated by the sort of requisition which I received. As all, however, do not turn their attention to this precise mode of investigation, perhaps it might have been a pity that my collections should die with me: and, accordingly, I do not repent the having thrown them into a manageable form and order; the less so, peradventure, because, by reason of their being thus incidentally *prepared* (a somewhat important consideration at my period of life), the labour of mere *composition* exacted from me no very formidable outlay either of time or of trouble.

II. The Evidential Principle of the Anglican Church, on which both this Work and also some former Works of mine have been composed, I have already, on various occasions, so fully explained and vindicated, that I deem it superfluous here to resume the subject*.

Yet I cannot refrain from taking the present

* See the Introduction to my *Apostolicity of Trinitarianism*, the Preface to my *Primitive Doctrine of Election*, and the

opportunity of noticing a singular mistake, which,

Preface and Appendix to my *Primitive Doctrine of Justification*. 2d Edit.

Though there are some matters in Mr. Palmer's *Treatise on the Church* to which I cannot assent: yet, in the midst of a surpassing copiousness of valuable matter and important information, I have been specially gratified by the clearness and soundness, with which he explains and points out the difference between the Genuine Anglican Appeal to Antiquity for the true sense of Doctrinal Scripture and a Spurious Roman Appeal to Antiquity, for the establishment of Doctrines and Doctrinal Practices of which Scripture knows nothing.

Tradition, says he, *sometimes means the Doctrine held by Christians, as distinguished from the* SAME *Doctrine written in the Bible. It is also equivalent to Custom, as in the thirty-fourth Article.*

Traditions, in the former sense, may be divided: into those, which have been commonly maintained in some particular age only, or which a portion of the Church has maintained without separating from the rest; and those, which the great body of Christians from the beginning, have held to be Articles of the Faith.

The former class of Traditions may be certainly true: but the Ecclesiastical Authority, which supports them, can only render them probable.

The latter sort of Traditions afford an irresistible confirmation of the Doctrine of Scripture and a certain test of the correctness of SCRIPTURE INTERPRETATION.

It is not here meant, that the REAL *sense of Scripture is* OBSCURE *in any points of Faith, or that it is* ESSENTIAL *for each individual, in order to understand the Scripture aright in such points, to consult previously the Traditions and Judgments of the Universal Church.—Scripture ought to be* ITSELF *sufficient for the overthrow of all errors against Faith. But, since*

so far as I have observed, regularly attends upon

men are liable to be misled, by the evil interpretations of others, to misunderstand the divine meaning of Scripture: the Doctrine or Tradition of Christians of all ages, that is, of the Catholic Church, is presented to us as a confirmation of the TRUE MEANING *of Scripture.*

It is not meant, that this Tradition conveys to us the exact interpretation of all the particular texts in the Bible. Its utility is of a simpler and more general character. It relates to THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE AS A WHOLE, *to* THE DOCTRINE DEDUCED FROM IT IN GENERAL.

That Doctrine, which claims TO BE DEDUCED FROM SCRIPTURE, *and which* ALL CHRISTIANS BELIEVED FROM THE BEGINNING, *must be truly scriptural.*

That Doctrine, which claims TO BE DEDUCED FROM SCRIPTURE, *and which* ALL THE CHURCH FROM THE BEGINNING REPROBATED AND ABHORRED, *must be founded on the perversion and misrepresentation of Scripture.*

The difference, between the Anglo-Catholic and the Popular Romish Doctrine of Tradition, is this.

The former only admits Tradition, as CONFIRMATORY OF THE TRUE MEANING OF SCRIPTURE.

The latter asserts: that it is also SUPPLEMENTARY *to Scripture,* CONVEYING DOCTRINES WHICH SCRIPTURE HAS OMITTED. Treatise on the Church, part iii. chap 3. vol. ii. p. 44—46. 2d Edit.

It is satisfactory likewise to observe an able and well-instructed layman, clearly apprehending and distinctly stating a Principle, which, in the present day, some persons appear determined not to understand, while others, I grieve to say, labour to corrupt it into the Principle laid down by the Council of Trent.

The Early Church, remarks Mr. Gladstone, *prayed more and more fervently than we do. In addition, it had the character and*

the frequent triumphant adduction of the famous

competency of A WITNESS TO MATTERS OF FACT. *The* DOCTRINES, *which it heard from its founders, were* MATTERS OF FACT, *contradistinguished from* MATTERS OF OPINION, *in that sense in which alone such a distinction can be fairly taken.—We do not say, that, upon all points, the Voice of the Church has been clearly and unequivocally uttered: but we say, that, where there has been such utterance, there we are in reason and duty bound, inwardly bound, to hearken and follow. That there are such cases, there is no doubt. The Creeds are examples.* The State in its relations with the Church. chap. v. § 44, 45. p. 160, 161.

The same Principle which, for at least a dozen years, I have been engaged in maintaining and working upon, is also very luminously and copiously propounded and asserted by Mr. Harcourt and the late excellent Bishop Van Mildert. See Harcourt's Doctrine of the Deluge, chap. xxviii. vol. ii. p. 569—571. Van Mildert's Bampt. Lect. Serm. iv. p. 94—97.

Against the Ancient Fathers and the Early Church, a succession of charges, both negative and positive, has lately been brought by an ingenious author who does not give his name.

In their teaching, it seems, they omitted the weightier matters of the Gospel: and occupied themselves, not very profitably, in gnosticising upon the virtues of Celibacy, in lauding the potent meritoriousness of Fasting, in prominently exhibiting the benefits attendant upon the Invocation of Dead Saints, and in determinately mystifying the Sacraments until those divine Ordinances assume the suspicious colour of the veritable romish *Opus Operatum*.

The professed object of these charges is to aim a blow at the well known Oxford *Tracts for the Times*. I do not quite clearly understand the author's chronology: for, though his special attack is upon what he calls the *Nicene Church*, meaning, I suppose, the Church subsequent to the first Council of

adage, of Chillingworth : *The Bible* ONLY *is the Religion of Protestants.*

Nice ; yet, in search of his materials, he seems inclined to travel back well nigh, if not altogether, to the apostolic times. Had he distinctly *limited* the term of his attack to the fourth and fifth centuries ; a very fair argument, on Tertullian's just principle that *Every Doctrinal Innovation is a Palpable Adulteration*, would have been brought against the Tract-Writers : but, if he means to carry up his censures to the *strictly* Primitive Church which conversed with the Apostles ; I should think, on the principles of Historical Testimony, PROVIDED his case could be *evidentially* established, that the Gentlemen of the Tract-School will hold themselves obliged to him for consolidating a much stronger argument in their favour than I have as yet chanced to encounter.

However this may be, I here mention the Work, simply lest it should be eagerly caught up, by some strenuous Misopaterist, as stultifying the *legitimate* Principle of an Appeal to Antiquity.

Agreeably to the wise recommendation of the Anglican Church, we, who are her dutiful sons, appeal, in the way of *evidence*, not to this Father or to that Father, but to the Entire Succession of the Fathers from the very Beginning : and, furthermore, we appeal to such Aboriginal Succession, not for the purpose of imposing upon the Faithful matters unscriptural or extrascriptural, but in order to ascertain, through their *harmonious testimony*, what was ALWAYS the catholic received sense of Doctrinal Scripture ; inasmuch as our very Principle, in direct opposition to the spurious Tridentine Principle, is a *strict limitation* of our Appeal to the evidential ascertainment of the true Apostolical Sense of Doctrinal Scripture *only*.

Now, whatever gratuitous absurdities may have been personally advocated by the Fathers as we descend the stream of Chronology, and whatever unscriptural notions may have been

This wise and true and pious saying is perpetually brought forward, in order to shew Chillingworth's decided approbation of that modern Hermeneutic System, which, throwing aside all *Ancient Ecclesiastical Testimony to the true sense of Doctrinal Scripture*, would set up, in its place, the mere *Unsupported Opinion* or the mere *Insulated Private Judgment of each jarring and conceited individual.*

No such vague Empiricism, however, as the

by them heaped upon sound Catholic Doctrines: this cannot affect their unanimous TESTIMONY to the *Universal Reception of really Scriptural Doctrines from the very beginning.*

Let *all* the Fathers, if the author means to include them *all*, gnosticise ever so copiously on Fasting and Celibacy; or let them, with the Roman Clement unexpectedly at their head, labour ever so perseveringly to obscure and overlay the sincere Gospel by mystifying the Sacraments and by invocating the Saints: must we say, that *therefore* they become, henceforth and for ever, quite useless and incompetent WITNESSES, as to whether the Catholic Church, from the time of its foundation, universally held, or universally denied, the Doctrines of the Trinity and Christ's Godhead and the Atonement and many others, which, correctly or incorrectly in the abstract, are yet all professedly deduced from *Scripture*?

Truly, we might just as reasonably maintain: that those grave clerks, who, in the days of good King James, devoutly believed in Witchcraft, were *therefore* incompetent WITNESSES to the real quality of the Doctrinal System professedly deduced from *Scripture* by the Reformed Church of England.

System in question, seems ever to have crossed the well-exercised brain of Chillingworth. So far from it, he distinctly gives in his adhesion to that identical Anglican Principle of an *Appeal to Concurrent Antiquity*, for which, until better informed, I shall always feel it my duty to contend.

Let me tell you, says he, *the difference, between the various Protestant Reformers, is the difference, not between* GOOD *and* BAD, *but between* GOOD *and* BETTER. *And they did* BEST, *that followed* SCRIPTURE INTERPRETED BY CATHOLIC WRITTEN TRADITION: *which Rule the Reformers of the Church of England proposed to themselves to follow* *.

And again: *The Doctors of the Romish Church do the principal and proper work of the Socinians for them; undermining the Doctrine of the Trinity, by denying it to be supported by those* PILLARS OF THE FAITH, *which alone are fit and able to support it: I mean*, SCRIPTURE, *and* THE CONSENT OF THE ANCIENT DOCTORS †.

In thus delivering his own Principle of Scrip-

* Chillingworth's Relig. of Protest. chap. v. § 82. p. 285. Edit. tenth. London, 1742.

† Chillingworth's Relig. of Protest. Preface, § 16. p. 16. See my Apostolicity of Trinitarianism. book ii. chap. 1. § 1. 8.

tural Interpretation, which, as he truly states, is the Principle of the Church of England, Chillingworth seems not to have anticipated the remarkable modern discovery, that an Appeal to *Scripture* INTERPRETED *by Catholic Written Tradition* (I employ his own precise words) is no other than the Introduction of *A Second Rule of Faith which entirely supersedes and nullifies what ought to be the* SOLE *Rule:* and, as little, apparently, did he anticipate, that, in the rapid spread of Theological Light and Scriptural Knowledge wherewithal in the present day of great things we are blessed, he himself, because he had declared that *The Bible* ONLY *is the Religion of Protestants*, should, again and again, upon Platform and in Magazine, applauding and applauded, be adduced as the uncompromising advocate and the indubitable patron of that same discovery.

III. Notwithstanding this odd misapprehension of the real sentiments of a very able man, my respected Clerical Brother, like true William Chillingworth, saw clearly enough the value of Historical Testimony toward the settlement of those litigated Doctrinal Questions which spring out of Holy Scripture. On this perception, his

request to me was made: and, on the same perception, in the shape of the present Treatise, his request has been complied with.

Agreeably to the very principle of the great Author of *The Religion of Protestants*, I have, in the first place, consulted Scripture: and, to the best of my own Private Judgment, I have specified its import.

But, having no very implicit confidence in the mere Insulated Private Judgment either of myself or of any other man, I have finally, in the second place, as Chillingworth speaks, *followed Scripture interpreted by Catholic Written Tradition.*

In thus acting, if the decision of Chillingworth is to be trusted, *I did* BEST. At any rate, I have followed the Rule, which, as he truly remarks, the Reformers of the Church of England proposed to themselves to follow *. Should I be censured

* Imprimis videbunt concionatores, ne quid unquam doceant pro concione, quod a populo religiosè teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ Veteris aut Novi Testamenti, quodque ex illa ipsa doctrina Catholici Patres et Veteres Episcopi collegerint. Can. Eccles. Angl. xix. A. D. 1571.

This same Principle was distinctly set forth by Queen Elizabeth in reply to the foreign popish princes.

Anglia non novam aut alienam amplectitur religionem; sed

for this: I shall at least be censured in reasonably decent company.

eam, quam Christus jussit, prima et catholica Ecclesia coluit, et vetustissimi Patres una voce et mente comprobarunt. Camden. Annal. Eliz. A. D. 1559. p. 28.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

THE IDEALITY OF REGENERATION. p. 1.

CHAPTER I.

OPINIONS TOUCHING THE IDEALITY OF REGENERATION AND ITS CONNECTION WITH BAPTISM. p. 1.

Systems, which respect the Ideality of Regeneration and its Connection with Baptism. p. 2.

I. These Systems are three in number. p. 2.

1. An account of the first System. p. 2.
2. An account of the second System. p. 5.
3. An account of the third System. p. 7.

II. Summary of the three Systems. p. 13.

1. Summary of the first System. p. 14.
2. Summary of the second System. p. 15.
3. Summary of the third System. p. 15.

III. The respective agreement and disagreement of the three Systems. p. 16.

IV. To settle such matters, we must resort, first to Scripture itself, and next to Primitive Antiquity as the best witness to the true interpretation of Scripture. p. 17.

CHAPTER II.

THE IDEALITY OF REGENERATION, AS IT MAY BE COLLECTED FROM SCRIPTURE. p. 18.

To ascertain the true Ideality of Regeneration, it is most natural to commence with an examination of Scripture. p. 18.

I. The statement contained in the language of Christ, when he conversed with Nicodemus. p. 19.

1. Regeneration is said to be a birth from above. p. 20.
2. It is described as a birth from the Spirit. p. 21.
3. It is contrasted with the physical birth from the flesh. p. 22.
4. It is compared to the blowing of the wind. p. 22.

II. The statements furnished by St. John. p. 23.

III. The statements furnished by St. Peter. p. 24.

1. Remarks on the first statement. p. 25.
2. Remarks on the second statement. p. 26.

IV. According to the statements contained in Scripture, the true Ideality of Regeneration is, principally a *Moral Change of Disposition*, and thence subordinately and connectedly a *Federal Change of Relative Condition*. p. 28.

CHAPTER III.

THE IDEALITY OF REGENERATION, AS IT MAY BE COLLECTED FROM THE EARLY FATHERS. p. 29.

We must next hermeneutically inquire, what, according to the testimony of the Early Fathers, is the true Ideality of Regeneration, as received by the Church from the beginning. p. 29.

I. The Witnesses of the first Class, shewing that Regeneration is a *Moral Change of Disposition*. p. 30.

1. Justin Martyr. p. 30.

2. Clement of Alexandria. p. 33.
3. Tertullian. p. 36.
4. Cyprian. p. 36.
5. Lactantius. p. 40.
6. Athanasius. p. 42.
7. Cyril of Jerusalem. p. 42.
8. Jerome. p. 42.
9. Augustine. p. 43.

II. The Witnesses of the second Class, shewing that Regeneration is also a *Federal Change of Condition*. p. 43.
1. Justin Martyr. p. 44.
2. Tertullian. p. 44.
3. Clement of Alexandria. p. 44.
4. Cyprian. p. 45.
5. Athanasius. p. 46.
6. Cyril of Jerusalem. p. 46.
7. Jerome. p. 47.
8. Augustine, p. 47.

CHAPTER IV.

REMARKS ON THE TESTIMONY BORNE BY THE EARLY FATHERS. p. 49.

The Ideality of Regeneration, as attested by the Early Fathers, cannot easily be mistaken. p. 49.

I. In the term *Regeneration*, the Ancients included the two ideas of a *Moral Change of Disposition* and a *Federal Change of Condition*. p. 49.
1. Their idea of a *Moral Change of Disposition*. p. 50.
2. Their idea of a *Federal Change of Condition*. p. 50.

II. The ultimate right and title to the privileges of Regeneration was thought to be derived from the *Efficacy and Meritoriousness of the Blood of the Atonement*. p. 51.

III. They taught, however, at the same time: that, through Baptism, a man might be admitted to that secondary part of Regeneration which consists of a Federal Change of Condition, without partaking of that primary part which consists of a Moral Change of Disposition. p. 52.

1. Cyprian. p. 53.
2. Cyril of Jerusalem. p. 55.
3. Jerome. p. 55.
4. Augustine. p. 56.

CHAPTER V.

CONCLUSION FROM THE EVIDENCE WHICH RESPECTS THE IDEALITY OF REGENERATION. p. 61.

Antiquity warrants not the nomenclature proposed by those Divines who advocate the first of the three Systems. p. 61.

I. The present matter is a question of pure historical testimony. p. 62.

II. The true import of Augustine's phraseology relative to Infants. p. 66.

BOOK II.

THE MEAN OR VEHICLE OF MORAL REGENERATION. p. 69.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHANNEL THROUGH WHICH MORAL REGENERATION IS CONVEYED. p. 69.

We have now, from the evidence of Scripture as understood by

Primitive Antiquity, to ascertain the Mode or Channel, through which, to fallen man, the Grace of Regeneration is conveyed. p. 69.

I. There is no difference of opinion, touching the conveyance of Regeneration, when Regeneration is simply viewed as a *Federal Change of Condition*. p. 70.

II. Any difference of opinion, therefore, touching the conveyance of Regeneration, can only occur, when Regeneration is additionally understood to import a *Moral Change of Disposition*. p. 71.

1. The view taken of its conveyance under this aspect by those who advocate the second System, as stated above. p. 71.

2. The view taken of its conveyance under the same aspect by those who advocate the third System, as similarly stated above. p. 72.

III. In settling this question, we must examine Scripture, in the first instance: and then, in the second instance, lest we should err in our interpretation of Scripture, we must hear the attestation of the early ecclesiastical writers to its sense as received in the Primitive Church Catholic. p. 72.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHANNEL THROUGH WHICH MORAL REGENERATION IS CONVEYED, AS IT MAY BE COLLECTED FROM SCRIPTURE. p. 74.

In an Inquiry as to the Channel through which *Moral Regeneration* is conveyed, our first resort is naturally to Scripture. p. 74.

I. The texts of Scripture, which bear upon it, shall first be nakedly stated. p. 75.

1. The first Class of texts. p. 75.

(1.) The first text. John iii. 1—8. p. 75.

(2.) The second text. 1 Corinth. vi. 11. p. 76.
(3.) The third text. Coloss. ii. 10—13. p. 77.
(4.) The fourth text. Rom. vi. 3, 4. p. 77.
(5.) The fifth text. Tit. iii. 4—7. p. 77.
2. The second Class of texts. p. 77.
(1.) The first text. John i. 11—13. p. 77.
(2.) The second text. 2 Corinth. v. 17. p. 77.
(3.) The third text. Galat. vi. 15. p. 78.
(4.) The fourth text. Ephes. ii. 10—13. p. 78.
(5.) The fifth text. Coloss. iii. 9—11. p. 78.
3. The third Class of texts. p. 78.
(1.) The first text. 1 Corinth. iv. 15. p. 78.
(2.) The second text. Philem. 10. p. 79.
(3.) The third text. 1 Peter i. 3. p. 79.
(4.) The fourth text. 1 Peter i. 22—25 p. 79.
(5.) The fifth text. James i. 17, 18. p. 79.
II. These same texts of Scripture, in the order of their Classes, shall next be examined and discussed. p. 79.
1. The texts of the first Class indisputably exhibit *Baptism,* as *one* divinely appointed channel through which *Moral Regeneration* is conveyed by the agency of the Spirit. p. 80.
2. The texts of the second Class furthermore exhibit *A Believing Reception of Christ however produced,* as *another* divinely appointed channel through which the Spirit communicates the grace of *Moral Regeneration.* p. 80.
3. The texts of the third Class additionally exhibit *The Revealed Word of God,* as yet a *third* divinely appointed channel through which *Moral Regeneration* is conveyed by the agency of the same Spirit. p. 85.

CHAPTER III.

AS SCRIPTURE DETERMINES THE CHANNEL THROUGH WHICH MORAL REGENERATION IS CONVEYED, TO BE THREE-FOLD: SO, CONSISTENTLY, IT DETERMINES ALSO, THAT MORAL REGENERATION IS NOT THE INSEPARABLE CONCOMITANT OF OUTWARD BAPTISM. p. 89.

As Scripture propounds *three* several channels through which *Moral Regeneration* is conveyed, it consistently indicates also, that *Moral Regeneration* is not the inseparable Concomitant of *Outward Baptism.* p. 89.

I. To this purpose speaks the Apostle Peter. p. 90.
1. First remark on the statement. p. 90.
2. Second remark on the statement. p. 92.

II. To the same purpose also speaks the Apostle Paul. p. 94.
1. In the judgment of the Early Church, *Circumcision under the Law* was a Sacrament of the same moral import as *Baptism under the Gospel.* p. 94.
2. A discussion of St. Paul's statement on this established principle. p. 103.

III. To the same purpose likewise speaks the Apostle John. p. 107.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DISPLAY OF GOD'S MERCY IN THE COMMUNICATING OF MORAL REGENERATION TO FALLEN MAN BY THREE SEVERAL CHANNELS. p. 111.

In the appointment of *three* several means of *Moral Regeneration,* we cannot but be struck with the exuberant display of God's Mercy. p. 111.

I. Were *Outward Baptism* the *sole* mean, a person, who, by reason of unworthy reception of the Sacrament, had

failed to obtain *Moral Regeneration*, could never *hereafter* obtain it: whence, since our Lord has declared its necessity to eternal salvation, such a person would clearly stand precluded from all possibility of entering into the kingdom of God. p. 112.

II. This terrible result, however, is avoided, by the mercy of God, who has appointed *two* yet additional means of *Moral Regeneration*. p. 115.

III. A testing of the system by Scripture, preparatory to its testing by the recorded judgment of the witnessing Church Catholic. p. 116.

1. Our Lord's decision, as to how far sin is pardonable, and how far unpardonable. p. 116.

(1.) One sin alone is ruled by him to be unpardonable. p. 116.

(2.) But the sin so ruled is not specified to be an *Unworthy and therefore Unprofitable Reception of Baptism*. p. 117.

2. The question is put out of all reasonable doubt by an actual case recorded in Scripture itself. p. 117.

(1.) The recorded case of the penitent thief on the cross. p. 118.

(2.) The reasoning, which inevitably flows from this case. p. 119.

CHAPTER V.

A REASONABLE ANTICIPATION OF THE GENERAL TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY CHURCH. p. 121.

From the preceding discussion, it is easy to anticipate the general testimony of the Early Church. p. 121.

I. The ground, on which we may reasonably anticipate, that, *officially*, the Church will declare all baptised persons to

be regenerate, and receive them into her communion accordingly. p. 121.

II. Though such, we may presume, would be her *official* language, we may fairly anticipate also, that she would carefully guard against misapprehension of it. p. 122.

III. The remarkable attestation of Clement of Alexandria to this precise principle. p. 129.

CHAPTER VI.

STATEMENTS OF THE EARLY FATHERS RESPECTING THE CONCOMITANCE OF MORAL REGENERATION UPON OUTWARD BAPTISM VIEWED AS A MEAN OR CHANNEL. p. 134.

The Early Fathers perpetually describe *Baptism*, as the sensible or visible or cognizable mean, through which, to the devout recipient, the grace of *Moral Regeneration* is communicated. p. 134.

I. Justin Martyr. p. 135.
II. Irenèus. p. 136.
III. Clement of Alexandria. p. 137.
IV. Tertullian. p. 137.
V. Cyprian. p. 139.
VI. Athanasius. p. 139.
VII. Cyril of Jerusalem. p. 140.
VIII. Ambrose. p. 141.
IX. Jerome. p. 141.
X. Augustine. p. 142.

CHAPTER VII.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS OF THE EARLY FATHERS. p. 143.

Before we pronounce that the Early Fathers attest the Church to

teach the *Inseparability of outward Baptism and Moral Regeneration* we must hear their own explanatory statements. p. 143.

I. Of such explanatory statements we possess a number, amply sufficient to set the present question at rest. p. 145.

1. Justin Martyr. p. 145.
2. Tertullian. p. 147.
3. Jerome. p. 148.
4. Ambrose. p. 149.
5. Augustine. p. 150.
6. Cyril of Jerusalem. p. 157.

II. The statements are perfectly unambiguous: but that of Cyril is specially valuable, on account of the office which he held in the Church. p. 160.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DOCTRINES OF THE EARLY FATHERS, TOUCHING THE POSSIBILITY OF A FUTURE RECEPTION OF MORAL REGENERATION BY THOSE, WHO, ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR INSINCERITY AND UNWORTHINESS HAD FAILED TO RECEIVE IT THROUGH THE MEDIUM OF OUTWARD BAPTISM. p. 162.

The case of an unworthy, and therefore ineffectual, Recipient of Baptism. p. 162.

I. The case was perceived and solved by the Early Church. p. 164.

1. Clement of Alexandria expressly states: that, on *Repentance* and *Conversion*, a person may be morally regenerated *after* Baptism, who through unfitness had failed to receive Regeneration *in* Baptism. p. 164.
2. The same doctrine, expressed in a varied phraseology, was likewise taught at a somewhat later period. p. 168.

(1.) Statement of Athanasius. p. 168.
(2.) Statement of Ambrose. p. 169.
(3.) Statement of Jerome. p. 170.
(4.) Statement of Augustine. p. 171.

3. From a period yet earlier than his own, even the apostolic period itself, Clement of Alexandria furthermore hands down a remarkable narrative touching a captain of robbers: who, first, received Baptism unworthily; then, having failed of deriving from the Sacrament any Moral Change of Disposition, plunged into all manner of excess and rapine and violence; and, finally, through the ministration of St. John, became a striking instance of God's mercy, in his Postbaptismal Regeneration. p. 173.

II. In primitive times, no doubt, we less frequently hear, in express terms, of a Moral Regeneration, communicated, at a subsequent period, to those, who had been unworthy Recipients *of* Baptism, and who thence had failed of having it communicated to them *in* Baptism: but, for this circumstance, it is not very difficult to give a sufficient reason. p. 182.

1. The reason will be found in the principle, on which the Early Church dealt with those who had lapsed. p. 183.

2. In adopting this principle, the Early Church seems to have copied St. Paul in his mode of dealing with the Galatians, when he doubted whether Christ had ever been formed in them, and thence determined to make a second effort on the supposition that his first preaching the Gospel to them might (at least in the case of some) have been spiritually ineffective. Galat. iv. 13, 19, 20. p. 185.

CHAPTER IX.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE EARLY FATHERS, TOUCHING THE POSSIBILITY OF A RECEPTION OF MORAL REGENERATION, EITHER BEFORE BAPTISM, OR IN SOME CASES WITHOUT BAPTISM. p. 193.

The two points, BEFORE *Baptism* and WITHOUT *Baptism*, stand very closely connected. p. 194.

I. The adjudged case of one, who suffered martyrdom, *anterior* to his reception of Baptism. p. 196.

1. The adjudication was built upon the case of the penitent thief. p. 197.

(1.) Cyprian. p. 198.

(2.) Cyril of Jerusalem. p. 199.

(3.) Athanasius. p. 200.

(4.) Jerome. p. 201.

(5.) Augustine. p. 201.

2. The inevitable result of the adjudication. p. 203.

II. The case of those, who were prevented receiving Baptism before their death, though they died not the death of martyrdom. p. 204.

1. Here, the Ancient Church made, from analogy and from natural reasonableness, the same favourable adjudication. p. 205.

2. The distinct testimony of Augustine to this effect. p. 207.

III. The statements of the Early Fathers in accordance with such principles or results. p. 211.

1. Clement of Rome. p. 211.

2. Ignatius. p. 213.

3. Irenèus. p. 214.

4. Tertullian. p. 216.

5. Athanasius. p. 216.

6. Augustine. p. 220.

IV. Brief remarks on the foregoing statements. p. 222.
1. Remarks on the kindred phraseology of Clement and Athanasius. p. 222.
2. Remarks on the curiously varied phraseology of Ignatius. p. 223.
3. Remarks on the statement of Tertullian. p. 224.
4. Remarks on the language of Athanasius. p. 224.
5. Remarks on the language of Irenèus. p. 225.
6. Remarks on the special distinctness of Augustine's statement. p. 225.

BOOK III.

INFANT-BAPTISM. p. 227.

CHAPTER I.

ANTIQUITY OF INFANT-BAPTISM.

The well-ascertained FACT of *Infant-Baptism* in the Primitive Church. p. 227.
I. The testimony of Justin-Martyr. p. 228.
1. His testimony sufficiently establishes the existence of the practice at the time when he wrote, or about the middle of the second century. p. 230.
2. But it is also worded in such a manner, as yet further to establish the existence of the practice in the days of the Apostles. p. 235.
II. The testimony of Irenèus. p. 235.
III. The testimony of Tertullian. p. 237.
IV. The testimony of Cyprian. p. 238.
V. The allusion of Clement of Rome. p. 239.
VI. The evidence comprehends the whole Primitive Catholic Church, both in the East, and in the West, and in the South. p. 240.

CHAPTER II.

CONFLICTING ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF THE ABSOLUTE INSEPARABILITY OF OUTWARD BAPTISM AND MORAL REGENERATION IN THE CASE OF INFANT-RECIPIENTS. p. 241.

The arguments of those, who, in the case of Infant-Recipients, *maintain* the Absolute Inseparability of Outward Baptism and Moral Regeneration. p. 242.

I. The first argument. p. 243.
1. The first reply to it. p. 244.
2. The second reply to it. p. 244.

II. The second argument. p. 245.
1. The first reply to it. p. 245.
2. The second reply to it. p. 247.

III. The third argument, being built upon an *alleged* FACT, can have no weight, until the *alleged* FACT shall have been *substantiated*. p. 253.

CHAPTER III.

CONFLICTING ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE ABSOLUTE INSEPARABILITY OF OUTWARD BAPTISM AND MORAL REGENERATION IN THE CASE OF INFANT-RECIPIENTS. p. 256.

The arguments of those, who, in the case of Infant-Recipients, either *doubt* or *deny* the Invariable Concurrence of Outward Baptism and Moral Regeneration. p. 256.

I. The first argument, on this side of the question, will be the most conveniently considered, if the discussion of it be thrown into the form of a disputation. p. 257.
1. The first closing of the disputants *for* and *against* the argument. p. 257.

(1.) Case made out by the disputant *for* the argument. p. 257.
(2.) Case made out by the disputant *against* the argument. p. 258.
2. The second closing of the disputants. p. 259.
(1.) Plea *for* the argument. p. 259.
(2.) Plea *against* the argument. p. 261.
3. The third closing of the disputants. p. 265.
(1.) Plea *for* the argument. p. 265.
(2.) Plea *against* the argument. p. 270.
4. The fourth and final closing of the disputants. p. 271.
(1.) Plea *for* the argument. p. 271.
(2.) The author's confessed inability to fabricate an Answer to the Plea. p. 276.
II. The second argument can only be answered by a denial of the moral identity of Circumcision and Baptism: which, for more reasons than one, is a dangerous and inconvenient process. p. 276.
1. The first reason. p. 278.
2. The second reason. p. 279.
3. The third reason. p. 282.

CHAPTER IV.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY CHURCH TOUCHING THE MORAL EFFECT OF INFANT-BAPTISM. p. 289.

There is a very considerable difficulty in settling, upon primeval testimony, the question: *Whether, in the case of Infant-Recipients, Moral Regeneration invariably attends upon Outward Baptism.* The reason is: because the specially early Fathers, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Hermas, Pseudo-Barnabas, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, and the Author of the Epistle to Diognetus, are

altogether silent on the subject. We are compelled, therefore to descend to somewhat lower evidence: nor, I believe, do we find the matter fully entered into, until we reach the time of Augustine, though some earlier notices, here and there, may perhaps be collected. p. 289.

I. Irenèus. p. 290.

1. The argument involved in his statement. p. 291.
2. The conclusion approximates to the question now before us, but does not quite exactly touch it. p. 291.
3. We learn, nevertheless, from it, a point not devoid of importance. p. 292.

II. Tertullian. p. 292.

III. The Author of *Questions and Answers to the Orthodox*. p. 295.

1. The Doctrine involved in this writer's Principle. p. 295.
2. The Principle affords evidence to a Fact. p. 296.
3. The same Principle was advocated by Augustine. p. 298.

IV. Augustine. p. 299.

1. A collection of the various statements of Augustine. p. 300.
   (1.) The first statement. p. 300.
   (2.) The second statement. p. 305.
   (3.) The third statement. p. 309.
   (4.) The fourth statement. p. 309.
2. Remarks on the statements of Augustine. p. 311.
   (1.) The first remark. p. 311.
   (2.) The second remark. p. 313.
   (3.) The third remark. p. 320.
   (4.) The fourth remark. p. 321.
   (5.) The fifth remark. p. 323.

BOOK IV.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. p. 325.

CHAPTER I.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TOUCHING REGENERATION. p. 325.

A discussion of the Doctrine of the Church of England touching Regeneration will form no improper appendage to the present Treatise. p. 325.

I. The principle of the Church of England is to appeal to Antiquity. p. 325.

II. Hence, her Doctrine touching Regeneration will assuredly be that of the Early Church. p. 326.

CHAPTER II.

THE STATEMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. p. 330.

The Church of England *generically* declares those, who have been baptised, to be regenerate. p. 330.

I. The two Baptismal Offices are perfectly satisfactory: and, speaking the very language and adopting the very principle of the Early Church, they require not, as some worthy individuals have occasionally urged, the slightest alteration. p. 330.

II. The Catechism proceeds exactly on the same principle, and exhibits the same ecclesiastical correctness of phraseology. p. 335.

III. The Office for Confirmation is constructed in a similar manner. p. 336.

IV. The Liturgy. p. 336.
V. The Baptismal Article. p. 337.
VI. Documents authorised and received as her own by the Church of England. p. 337.
1. King Edward's Catechism. p. 337.
2. The Apology of Bishop Jewel. p. 338.
3. The Catechism of Dean Nowel. p. 339.

CHAPTER III.

THE EXPLANATIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. p. 341.

The Explanatory Cautions of the Anglican Church, respecting her *official* and *generic* declarations, are precisely the same as those of the Early Church. p. 341.
I. The Explanatory Cautions contained in the Articles. p. 343.
1. The case of Adults. p. 343.
2. The case of Infants. p. 344.
3. The case of Unworthy Recipiency. p. 347.
II. The Explanations contained in the Liturgy. p. 351.
III. The Explanation contained in the Homily. p. 355.
1. The Systematic Rationalè of the Church of England. p. 360.
2. Moral Regeneration required under the Law, as well as under the Gospel. p. 361.
IV. The Explanations contained in the other authorised Documents. p. 363.
1. King Edward's Catechism. p. 363.
2. Bishop Jewel's Apology. p. 364.
3. Dean Nowel's Catechism. p. 367.
V. The same Explanations are given by a Chain of our best Divines from the Reformation downward. p. 368.

CHAPTER IV.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION. p. 370.

A General Summary followed by a Conclusion. p. 370.

I. The General Summary. p. 370.

1. The first point. p. 370.
2. The second point. p. 371.
3. The third point. p. 371.
4. The fourth point. p. 371.
5. The fifth point. p. 373.
6. The sixth point. p. 373.
7. The seventh point. p. 373.

(1.) The use of the apostolical tests in the way of evidence. p. 373.

(2.) The use of the apostolical tests in the way of practice. p. 374.

II. The Conclusion. p. 375.

1. The practical language of good men who hold the tenet of *Inseparability*, and the practical language of good men who hold the tenet of *Separability*, will be the same in *object*, though based upon different theological *principles*. p. 375.

(1.) The language of the former. p. 375.

(2.) The language of the latter. p. 376.

2. If, then, in the intention of all good men, the practical object be the same, let not the Theologians of different Schools think unkindly of each other, or, while travelling on their common pilgrimage, quarrel in the way. p. 377.

APPENDIX.

STATEMENTS, TOUCHING BAPTISM AND REGENERATION, BY VARIOUS EMINENT ANGLICAN DIVINES, FROM THE TIME OF THE REFORMATION, DOWN TO THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. p. 379.

Various eminent Divines of the Church of England, from the time of the Reformation, down to the nineteenth century, deny the Necessary and Invariable Concomitancy of the Inward Grace upon the Outward Sign of Baptism. p. 379.

I. Extracts from the writings of sixteen Divines, referred to in chapter xv. § II. 5, as constituting a sort of *Catena Patrum Anglicanorum*. p. 379.

1. Archbishop Cranmer. p. 379.
2. Bishop Latimer. p. 379.
3. Bishop Hooper. p. 380.
4. Bishop Hall. p. 380.
5. Archbishop Usher. p. 381.
6. Mr. Richard Hooker. p. 382.
7. Bishop Reynolds. p. 383.
8. Bishop Hopkins. p. 383.
9. Bishop Pearson. p. 384.
10. Bishop Wilkins. p. 385.
11. Bishop Burnet. p. 385.
12. Dr. Isaac Barrow. p. 386.
13. Bishop Butler. p. 386.
14. Archbishop Tillotson. p. 387.
15. Bishop Horsley. p. 388.
16. Bishop Barrington. p. 388.

II. Some remarks on the preceding extracts. p. 390.
1. The Doctrinal System, maintained by this succession of Divines, is the same as that, which, in the present Treatise, is shewn to have been the Doctrinal System of the Primitive Church. p. 390.
2. Explanatory remark on the System of Archbishop Usher. p. 390.

ERRATA.

Page	Line	
vii.	5.	For *abduction*, read *adduction*.
33.	19 note.	Insert a colon ' after ῥᾳστι.
33.	20 note.	For ἐπονομάξεται, read ἐπονομάζεται.
35.	14 note.	For ἄμαρτία, read ἁμαρτίᾳ.
39.	1 note.	For *jaceram*, read *jacerem*.
39.	15 note.	For *vaste*, read *veste*.
40.	4 note.	For *inflat*, read *inflet*.
40.	5 note.	For *delectat*, read *delectet*.
44.	9 note.	For *recensentur*, read *recensetur*.
55.	5 note.	For προαίρεσε, read προαιρέσει.
55.	10 note.	For κατέβε, read κατέβη.
64.	15 note.	For *colluire*, read *colluvie*.
66.	1.	For *writer's*, read *writers*.
96.	11.	Insert a comma after *then*.
100.	4 note	For Κολοσσεῖις, read Κολοσσεῖς.
111.	6.	For *benificent*, read *beneficent*.
112.	3 note.	For *duce nativitatis*, read *duæ nativitates*.
133.	3 note.	For καινὸ, read καινὸς.
142.	2 note.	For *dici*, read *diei*.
146.	9 note.	For ἀξύμων, read ἀζύμων.
152.	4 note.	Erase the comma after *manuum*.
154.	2 note.	Erase the period after *visibilibus*.
158.	2 note.	For ἔχης, read ἔχῃς.
158.	7 note.	For ἐμπέσης, read ἐμπέσῃς.
169.	4 note.	For καθαρίξει, read καθαρίζει.
170.	11 note.	For *scepe*, read *sæpe*.
184.	17.	For *Matanœa*, read *Metanœa*.
187.	3.	For *synonyme*, read *synonymn*.
203.	2 note.	For *latroille*, read *latro ille*.
220.	4 note.	For χρηματίξομεν, read χρηματιζόμεν.
239.	6 note.	For *majis*, read *magis*.
240.	2 note.	For *dici*, read *diei*.
305.	24 note.	For *eum*, read *cum*.
309.	4 note.	For *evacuatur*, read *evacuetur*.
339.	3 note.	For *constituerat*, read *constitueret*.

THE PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION.

CHAP. I.

BOOK I.

THE IDEALITY OF REGENERATION.

CHAPTER I.

OPINIONS TOUCHING THE IDEALITY OF REGENERATION AND ITS CONNECTION WITH BAPTISM.

It not unfrequently happens, I believe, that between two sturdy disputants, the interminable prolongation of a Controversy, without any satisfactory result, is mainly, if not altogether, occasioned by mutual misapprehension. They rush into combat, without propounding any accurate definition or any careful explanation of the terms which they employ: and, thus severally using the same word in a different sense, we require not the gift of prophecy to anticipate, that, in *such* a mode of conducting the argument, they can never come to any agreement.

If, for instance, in discussing the subject of Baptism, *this* man, without any specification of

his intention, employs the term *Regeneration* in *this* sense; while *that* man, equally without notification, employs it in *that* sense: it is quite obvious, that so long as they are mutually unconscious of the circumstance and thence mutually misunderstand each other, they may go on bootlessly disputing to all eternity.

In the present Treatise, I purpose to inquire into THE PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION.

That we may labour, therefore, under no misapprehension as to the opinions entertained respecting both the *Ideality of Regeneration* and the *Amount of its Connection with the Outward Rite of Baptism*, it will be useful to commence an Inquiry of this nature with some account of the opinions in question.

I. By modern Theologians, three several Systems have been propounded, which alike claim to exhibit the true sense of Scripture touching Baptism and Regeneration.

1. The first of these Systems, as specially bearing upon the two points of *Ideality* and *Connection*, may be stated in manner following.

Regeneration is not *An Internal Change in the Soul of Fallen Man:* but it is only *An External Change of Man's Relative State toward God.* In other words, Regeneration is not A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION: but it is, purely and exclusively, A FEDERAL CHANGE OF CONDITION.

As thus defined in regard to the point of *Ideality*,

Regeneration always accompanies Baptism: and it evinces great incorrectness of Phraseology, if, upon A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION, we bestow the name of *Regeneration*. This MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION, so essential to the character of a true Christian, is indeed *implied* and *promised* in Baptism: according as, in the baptised subject, it has either *already* taken place, or may *hereafter* take place. But, in the strict technical language of Theology, it ought not to be denominated *Regeneration*. Its true and legitimate title is *Conversion* or *Renovation*.

Hence, would we theologise correctly, the term *Regeneration* on the one hand, and the term *Conversion* or *Renovation* on the other hand, ought never to be confounded together. The necessity, indeed, of keeping up this distinction, instead of loosely and popularly applying to *Conversion* the name of *Regeneration*, will appear from the following circumstance. While Regeneration, in its true *Ideality*, is so inseparably connected with Baptism, as to warrant, in a manner, our asserting their virtual identity; Conversion, which is A CHANGE OF THE HEART OR A MORAL RENOVATION OF THE INWARD FRAME, may occur, according to God's good pleasure, either before Baptism, or in Baptism, or after Baptism: insomuch that persons, though morally converted *before* Baptism, are not regenerate until they shall have *received* Baptism; and persons, again, though not morally

converted either *before* Baptism or *in* Baptism, are, nevertheless, *through* Baptism, truly regenerated.

The accuracy, in short, of the entire statement, rests upon the correct definition of the term *Regeneration:* and its correct definition is simply A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION; each baptised individual being brought, by Baptism, into covenant with God, and thence invested with a full right to all the benefits and privileges of the Gospel *.

* This System was maintained by Dr. Waterland and Bishop Van Mildert: and it has recently been advocated, at considerable length, by Bishop Bethell. See Waterland's Regener. stated and explained. § I, II. Works, vol. vi. p. 343—362. Van Mildert's Bampton Lect. serm. vi. p. 162, 163, and notes in loc. p. 327—331. Bethell's General View of the Doctr. of Regen. in Bapt. chap. ii. p. 10—20.

With the aid of Bishops Van Mildert and Bethell, who have professedly adopted it, I have, to the best of my comprehension, set forth, in the text, what I *suppose* to be the System of Dr. Waterland: but, in *his own* evolution of it, there is a degree of obscurity and a want of consistent precision, which, unless I had found *their* view of it the same as that taken by *myself*, might make me fear, perhaps not quite unreasonably, that I had peradventure misunderstood him.

Dr. Waterland, as those two respected Prelates seem to agree with me in expounding him, would confine the idea of *Regeneration* to that of a *Federal Change of Relative State or Condition:* while, under the name of *Renovation* or *Conversion*, a name which must never be confounded with that of *Regeneration*, he would make the *Moral Change of Disposition*, which the Fall has rendered essentially necessary, to be, not *Regene-*

2. The second of the Systems, as similarly bearing upon the two points of *Ideality* and *Connection*, may be stated in the following terms.

As connected with the Initiatory Rite of Bap-

ration itself, to which he annexes an entirely different idea, but rather in the case of Infants, a *Contingent Consequence of Regeneration as thus defined by him*, and, in the case of Adults, a *Matter which may occur both before and in and after Baptism.*

Yet, nevertheless, he occasionally employs language, which, on his part, apparently intimates an admission: that the true Ideality of Regeneration comprehends the notion of a *Moral Change of Disposition* as well as the notion of a *Federal Change of Condition.*

That the ground of my perplexity may be understood, Dr. Waterland shall himself speak, in his own proper person, and in his own precise words.

The general Doctrine, both of our Lord and of St. Paul, is: that Water applied outwardly to the Body, together with THE GRACE OF THE SPIRIT APPLIED INWARDLY TO THE SOUL, *regenerates the Man; or, in other words, the Holy Spirit, in and by the use of Water-Baptism, causes the New Birth.* Regen. stated and explain. in init. Works, vol. vi. p. 342.

Regeneration, passively considered, is but another word for the New Birth of a Christian: and that New Birth, in the general, means A SPIRITUAL CHANGE WROUGHT UPON ANY PERSON, BY THE HOLY SPIRIT, IN THE USE OF BAPTISM; *whereby he is translated, from his Natural State in Adam, to a Spiritual State in Christ.* Ibid. § I. p. 343.

Having said what I conceived sufficient upon the first article respecting Regeneration, I now proceed to the second, which is Renovation, and which I understand of A RENEWAL OF HEART OR MIND. *Indeed, Regeneration itself is a kind of Renewal; but then it is of* THE SPIRITUAL STATE CON-

tism, Regeneration is A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION. But we shall greatly err, if we stop short with so scanty and imperfect a definition. It is *this*, indeed: but then it is like-

SIDERED AT LARGE: *whereas Renovation, the other article, seems to mean a more particular kind of Renewal, namely, of* THE INWARD FRAME OR DISPOSITION OF THE MAN; *which is rather a capacity or qualification, in Adults, for salutary Regeneration, than the Regeneration itself. Regeneration may be granted and received, as in Infants, where that Renovation has no place at all for the time being: and, therefore, most certainly, the* NOTIONS *are very distinct.* Ibid. § II. p. 349.

Now what is it that Dr. Waterland wishes us to understand by *Regeneration?*

If he limits the idea of it to a *Federal Change of Relative State or Condition;* which the whole drift of his Treatise, and his studied distinction between *Regeneration* and *Renovation*, lead us to suppose: how can it be a *Spiritual Change wrought by the Holy Ghost;* and how, on the apparently avowed principle of his System, can he correctly say, that a Man is regenerated by *the Grace of the Spirit applied inwardly to the soul?*

If, on the contrary, he extends the idea of it to a *Moral Change of Disposition;* which the passages, cited above, might seem to import: wherein does it *notionally* differ from *Renovation*, which he defines to be a *Renewal of the Inward Frame or Disposition of the Man?*

So long as the *notion* of Regeneration is strictly and uniformly limited to a *Federal Change of Relative State or Condition*, while the *notion* of Renovation is no less strictly and uniformly limited to a *Moral or Spiritual Change of Disposition*, I can readily perceive, that, as Dr. Waterland speaks, *most certainly, the* NOTIONS *are very distinct.*

But, when I turn to the preceding passages and note the

wise *much more*. For its definition will not be complete, unless it be additionally specified to be A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION.

In point, then, of *Ideality*, Regeneration must be completely defined to be A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION ASSOCIATED WITH A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION: and, as thus defined, it *always*, save in the excepted case of impenitent or profane or infidel reception by Adults, accompanies Baptism; inasmuch as Baptism is the divinely appointed sacramental instrument or mean or channel, through which *alone* it is communicated *.

3. The third of the Systems, still as bearing upon the two points of *Ideality* and *Connection*, may finally be stated as follows.

mode wherein he *there* expresses himself, I freely confess that I am unable to comprehend the asserted *distinctness of the* NOTIONS.

It is quite true, that Dr. Waterland would exhibit Regeneration, as a *Renewal of the Spiritual State considered at large*, while he pronounces Renovation to be a *More particular kind of Renewal of the Inward Frame or Disposition of the Man*. But, whatever he may precisely mean by this distinction, there is clearly, according to *his own* account of the matter, no NOTIONAL difference between the two. Indeed, he himself gives the name of *Renewal*, and thence (we may conclude) its quality also, to Regeneration no less than to Renovation.

* This System, both as it respects Infants and as it respects Adults, is, I believe, pretty widely advocated by Modern Divines of the Church of England. It has recently been maintained, at considerable length by Mr. Harcourt. See

Regeneration, as concerns its true and correct definition, is A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION ASSOCIATED WITH A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELA-

Doctrine of the Deluge. chap. xxvii. — xxix. vol. ii. p. 538—644.

On the System, as Mr. Harcourt states it, perhaps I may be allowed to make a few remarks.

As the true conclusion from the Doctrine of the Ancient Church, Mr. Harcourt admits: that the defect of genuine Faith, on the part of an Adult-Recipient of Baptism, *separates* the Inward Grace from the Outward Sign. But, when thus *separated*, the Inward Grace, he contends, is only in a state of *Suspension*, and will be *communicated* to the baptised person as soon as he shall have conformed to the true Faith.

Augustine, says he, *believed the efficacy of Baptismal Grace to be, in more than one way, conditionally suspended, and made contingent upon the course of human action.—The defect of true Faith was supposed to* SEPARATE *the Grace from the Outward Sign. But, still, it was only in a state of Suspension: and, as soon as the baptised person conformed to the true Faith, his baptism was of avail, as the channel through which the Holy Spirit was conveyed to him.*

In that case, says Augustine, He receives WHAT HE HAD NOT BEFORE, *that is, the* HOLY GHOST; *and begins to have, in a saving way, that which he had before so much the more detrimentally, by how much the more unworthily: for he receives the Church itself, and, in it, peace and charity and reconciliation through its proper fountain and the invisible Holy Spirit.—*

Now what is this but the very thing which Dr. Pusey has asserted in the Oxford Tracts?

Infant-Baptism, says he, the Ancient Church accounted an efficacious channel of Grace to ALL: *only they held, that the Grace,* SO IMPARTED, *might be* SUBSEQUENTLY WITHDRAWN,

TIVE CONDITION: and Baptism, by divine appointment, is its Outward and Visible Sign.

In point of nomenclature, *Regeneration* and

if the individual permanently resisted its workings. Otherwise, by virtue of that Sacrament, they held, that the New Nature, THEN IMPARTED, *would gradually overpower, weaken, and destroy, the Old Man.* Doctrine of the Deluge. chap. xxix. vol. ii. p. 627—630.

I. Here I would remark: that, in making this admission of a possible *Separation* of the Inward Grace from the Outward Sign, Mr. Harcourt approaches very closely to those Divines, who advocate what I shall arrange as a third System.

For, by saying that defect of true Faith *separates* the Inward Grace of Baptism from the Outward Sign, he, in effect, teaches: that Baptism may be administered *without* any conveyance of the Inward Grace of Moral Regeneration; and that the Inward Grace, which thus is *separated* from the Outward Sign, or, in other words, which thus is *not conveyed* in Baptism, may *hereafter* be conveyed, the *separation* ceasing whenever the baptised individual shall have true Faith.

Such is precisely the doctrine of those who advocate the third System: though, in their statement, it is free from at least a verbal difficulty, which seems to impede the statement of Mr. Harcourt.

1. While this able writer admits, that the defect of true Faith *separates* the Inward Grace from the Outward Sign: he, nevertheless, speaks of Baptism being *still* the channel, through which the Holy Ghost is *hereafter* conveyed to a person, in whose case, by the very tenor of the statement, the Inward Grace and the Outward Sign were absolutely *separated* from each other at the time when Baptism was administered.

Now, if, in the supposed case, Regenerative Grace was *not* conveyed in Baptism: since it is a ruled point that Baptism is

Conversion and *Renovation* are but different names of that one great Spiritual Change which our Lord pronounced necessary to man's eternal salvation.

not to be repeated, I perceive not, how an *already* received Baptism can *hereafter* be the channel of conveying to a person, what, by the hypothesis, had *never*, in such already received Baptism from which it was *separated* through defect of true Faith, been conveyed to him *before*.

2. On this subject, the term *suspension*, as employed by Mr. Harcourt, gives me no clear idea.

I can readily understand, how a contingent *promise* may be conveyed in Baptism, and how such *promise* may be accomplished many years after the ineffective administration of Baptism: but I cannot understand, how the *subject-matter* of that contingent promise, the Inward Grace of Moral Regeneration to wit, can *itself* be conveyed, through Baptism *as a channel*, at some indefinite time *after* that very Baptism was administered.

II. There is yet another remark, which I shall hazard upon the statement now before us.

Mr. Harcourt speaks of the conclusion, to which he has been brought by the language of Augustine and the Ancient Church, as *identical* with the conclusion, to which, by the same language, Dr. Pusey professes *himself* to have been brought.

This, I think, is a mistake. In point both of *subject* and of *circumstance*, Mr. Harcourt's conclusion is a conclusion altogether distinct and essentially different from that of Dr. Pusey.

Mr. Harcourt's conclusion respects *Adults*: and it states the supposition of the Ancient Church to be, that, in the administration of Baptism to such subjects, the Inward Grace, from a defect in true Faith, might be *separate* from the Outward

When thus defined in regard to Ideality and when thus arranged in regard to Nomenclature, Regeneration, so far as it respects its primary character of A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION, inasmuch as it is a *Moral Conversion of the Heart* or a *Moral Renovation of the Inward Frame*, may, according to the divine pleasure, take place, either before Baptism, or in Baptism, or after Baptism.

Hence, so far as respects its secondary character of A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION, according as Regeneration occurs *before Baptism* or *in Baptism* or *after Baptism*, the Outward Rite of Baptism bears to it the relation

Sign; though, *hereafter*, the Inward Grace, which had *not* been received at Baptism, might, through a future conformity to the true Faith, be *still* received.

Dr. Pusey's conclusion respects *Infants*: and it states the supposition of the Ancient Church to be, that, in the administration of Baptism to such subjects, the Inward Grace of a New Nature is *invariably imparted*; though, *subsequently*, if the individual permanently resisted its workings, it might be *withdrawn*.

Thus the two conclusions are perfectly distinct and dissimilar. For the one respects only *certain baptised Adults*, who were judged to have *not* received the Inward Grace along with the Outward Sign; though they might *hereafter* receive it: while the other respects *all baptised Infants*, who (according, at least, to Dr. Pusey) were judged to have *invariably* received the Inward Grace along with the Outward Sign; though, through permanent resistance, they might *hereafter* lose it.

of a *Seal of the Past* or an *Instrument of the Present* or an *Earnest of the Future**.

* This System, as I understand him, was advocated by Archbishop Tillotson. Beside incidental notices, he has discussed the subject at great length in five successive Sermons, or, as they might be fitly called, five successive Sections of a single regular Treatise.

I. The Summary of his Doctrine may be thus briefly given.

1. In point of nomenclature, *Circumcision of the Heart*, and *New Creation*, and *Conversion*, and *Spiritual Repentance* or (as the Greek imports) *Moral Transmentation*, and *Renovation* and *Regeneration* are only different names of the same thing. For they alike import that great Inward Revolution, from Nature to Grace, from Flesh to Spirit, from the Old Man to the New Man, which we may define to be A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION, and which our Lord has pronounced essential to an admission into the kingdom of God. Serm. cvi. vol. vi. p. 325, 326, 330, 331, 332, 333. Serm. cviii. vol. vi. p. 351, 352.

2. With respect to the communication of this mighty Change to fallen man, the Holy Spirit is the Primary Author and Agent. But, instrumentally, he works through three several means or channels: God's Ministers; God's Word in the Gospel; and Ourselves. Serm. cviii. vol. vi. p. 351, 352.

II. In the five Sermons which jointly constitute his regular Treatise, the Archbishop does not enumerate Outward Baptism among those instrumental causes or means of Inward Regeneration which he arranges in subordination to the agency of the Holy Spirit.

This omission is extraordinary: and must certainly be deemed a defect. Perhaps it may, in some sort, be supplied by a passage which occurs incidentally in another part of his Works.

Water in Baptism, without any substantial change made in

II. From these statements it will appear, that the following Summary may be given of the three Systems.

the element, may, by the divine blessing accompanying the institution, be effectual to the Washing away of Sin and Spiritual Regeneration. Serm. xxvi. vol. ii. p. 175, 176.

I suppose, therefore, we may add Baptism, as yet a fourth instrumental mean of Spiritual Regeneration or Renovation or Conversion, to the three which the Archbishop has specified in the body of the Treatise itself. At all events, he seems to deem it the *formal instrument* by which proselytes are federally admitted into the Christian Church, as of old the Israelites were federally admitted into the Levitical Church by the instrumentality of Circumcision. Serm. cvi. vol. vi. p. 328, 329.

III. From these several particulars, it inevitably follows: that the Archbishop rejected the doctrine of the *Inseparability of Outward Baptism and Inward Regeneration.* It also follows: that, according to the specific mean which the Holy Spirit might be pleased to employ, he believed the Conveyance of Inward Regeneration to occur, either *before* Baptism, or *in* Baptism, or *after* Baptism.

On such principles, he consistently pronounced: that men are not properly said to be regenerate, until a real Change, both in the temper of their minds and in the course of their lives, shall have taken place.

When this is done, says the Lord Primate, *and* NOT BEFORE, *they are said to be regenerate.* Serm. cix. vol. vi. p. 372.

IV. It cannot be alleged, that the distinguished Prelate uses the term *Regeneration* only after *a loose and popular manner.*

He is not *carelessly* speaking, without any nice regard to his choice of what has been esteemed the *only* correct nomenclature. On the contrary, in *mood and form,* he is propound-

1. The first System defines Regeneration to be simply A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION: and, under that aspect, determines it to

ing a SYSTEM, which as I have already observed, pervades and in fact constitutes the very *subject* of no less than five continuous Sermons: and these five Sermons make up an elaborate Treatise *of the Nature of Regeneration* (I use the Archbishop's own words) *and its Necessity in order to Justification and Salvation.*

V. That all misapprehension may be precluded, I shall subjoin his own statements in his own precise language.

The Scripture, which never robs God of the glory of his grace, does, I am sure, ascribe our Conversion and Repentance, our Regeneration and Sanctification, to several causes: to THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD; *to* HIS MINISTERS; *to* HIS WORD; *and to* OURSELVES.

To THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD, *as the Principal Author and Efficient:—to* THE MINISTERS OF GOD, *as the instruments of our Conversion:—to* THE WORD OF GOD, *as the subordinate mean and instrument of our Conversion:—and, lastly, to* OURSELVES, *as concurring, some way or other, to this work.—*

So that all these causes, THE SPIRIT OF GOD, *and* HIS MINISTERS, *and* HIS WORD, *and* WE OURSELVES, *do all, some way or other, concur and contribute to this effect.*

God, indeed, is the Principal: and hath so great an hand in this work from beginning to end, that all the rest are nothing in comparison.—But, nevertheless, in strictness of speech sufficiently warranted by Scripture, THE MINISTERS OF GOD, *and* THE WORD OF GOD, *and* OURSELVES, *do all coöperate, some way or other, to our Conversion and Regeneration: and, by ascribing to any of these such parts as they truly have in this work, God is not robbed of any part of the glory of his grace, much less of the whole.* Serm. cviii. vol. vi. p. 351, 352.

VI. Many, whom it may be superfluous here to mention,

be *inseparably* connected with Baptism. But it insists not upon any such necessary and inseparable connection with Baptism, in regard to that MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION, which it would contradistinctively denominate *Conversion* or *Renovation*.

2. The second System defines Regeneration to be complexly A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION ASSOCIATED WITH A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION: and, under that aspect, broadly determines it to be *inseparably* connected with Baptism. But, while it thus broadly insists upon an *inseparable* connection, it excepts, from such inseparability, the case of an impenitent or profane or infidel reception of the Sacrament on the part of an Adult.

3. The third System similarly defines Regeneration to be complexly A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION ASSOCIATED WITH A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION: and, under that aspect, deeming A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION identical with *Conversion* or *Renovation*, it pronounces, that Regeneration is not so inseparably tied *to* Baptism, but that it may be conferred also either *before* Baptism or *after* Baptism.

have, in its great leading points, adopted the Archbishop's view of the matter: or perhaps, in strictness, I ought rather to say, have *jointly* followed his Grace and sundry others of those great Anglican Divines, who, from Cranmer downward, both went before him, and followed after him. See below, Append, § I.

III. This Summary will assist us in ascertaining the agreement and disagreement of the three Systems.

Between the first System and the third System, there is not much to settle beyond the question of *Correct Nomenclature*. For, while they disagree merely as to the proper mode of designating that MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION, which they alike deem essential to man's salvation: they agree in the belief, that this MORAL CHANGE, whether it ought contradistinctively to be called *Conversion* and *Renovation*, or whether it ought indifferently to be called either *Conversion* or *Renovation* or *Regeneration*, variously occurs, in various individuals, sometimes *before* Baptism, sometimes *at* Baptism, and sometimes *after* Baptism.

But, between the second System and the third System, and thence effectively between the second System and the first System also, there is a much more important question to settle. For, though the third System agrees with the second System in its definition of Regeneration; whence, on *that* point, those two Systems equally disagree with the first: yet the same third System and second System differ from each other, most essentially, on the point of *Separability or Inseparability*. Hence, the question to be settled, between the second System and the third System, and thence ultimately between the second System

and the first System also, is this: *Whether the necessary* MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION, *by whatever precise appellation we may most fitly designate it, invariably (with a single excepted case) takes place at Baptism; or whether it takes place, sometimes before Baptism, and sometimes in Baptism, and sometimes after Baptism.*

IV. For the best and most satisfactory settlement of all these various matters, we must, obviously, in the first instance, resort to the *Antiquity of Scripture.* But, since the true import of Scripture will probably be disputed, as in fact it is, by the several advocates of the three Systems: we must, I think, in the second instance, resort to *Ecclesiastical Antiquity, as exhibited in the Writings of the early Fathers,* that best and most authoritative Witness to what, from the beginning, was held to be the genuine interpretation of Scripture.

CHAPTER II.

THE IDEALITY OF REGENERATION, AS IT MAY BE COLLECTED FROM SCRIPTURE.

If we wish to ascertain the true Ideality of Regeneration, it seems most natural to begin with hearing what Holy Scripture itself propounds: for, though the sense of Scripture, when there is any dispute as to its import, must, as the Anglican Church wisely enforces, be determined by an appeal to the Consentient Judgment of Primitive Antiquity; yet, before the Evidence of Primitive Antiquity be called in to settle the point of Correct Interpretation, it is reasonable to begin, with attending to the statements of Scripture itself, and with deducing from those statements what may seem to be the fairest and most equitable conclusions.

The statements of Scripture, accordingly, I shall now proceed to exhibit.

I. In the exhibition of such statements, we

naturally commence with the language of our Lord in his discourse with Nicodemus.

There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. The same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him: Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.

Jesus answered and said unto him: Verily, verily, I say unto thee; Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

Nicodemus saith unto him: How can a man be born, when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?

Jesus answered: Verily, verily, I say unto thee; Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That, which is born of the flesh, is flesh: and that, which is born of the Spirit, is spirit. Marvel not, that I said unto thee: Ye must be born from above. The wind bloweth, where it listeth; and thou hearest the sound thereof: but thou canst not tell, whence it cometh, and whither it goeth. So is every one, that is born of the Spirit *.

If a person, untrained in technical Theology, were asked to express, what he conceives to be the import of this language, I doubt whether he would deliberately say: that, by the term *Rege-*

* John iii. 1—8.

neration or *Birth from above*, our Lord ought to be construed as meaning *nothing more*, than A FEDERAL CHANGE OF CONDITION formally effected by the instrumentality of Baptism. That A FEDERAL CHANGE OF CONDITION must be *included* in the Ideality of the term, is, indeed, from the circumstance of this *Birth from above* being associated with the official administration of Baptism, which has always been deemed the instrument of public ingraftation into the Church, most abundantly plain. But, when the very solemn and peculiar phraseology of Christ is duly considered, the untechnical Theologian will probably find it hard to believe: that *all notion* of A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION ought to be carefully excluded; and that the correct name of *that* Change is always *Conversion* or *Renovation*, never *Regeneration* or *Birth from above*.

For let us notice the characteristic description, which in several distinct articles, our Lord gives of the Birth whereof he is treating.

1. It is a *Birth from above*.

So, in two places, where our English Version, less accurately, employs the adverb *again*, runs the Original *. Now, by a *Birth from above*, can only, I suppose, be meant a *Birth from heaven* or a *Birth from the God of heaven*. But the obvious

* Gr. γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν. ver. 3. γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν. ver. 7. To express the precise sense *born again* or *regenerated*, the compound word ἀναγεγεννημένοι is used. See 1 Peter i. 23.

idea of a *Birth from heaven* is, both very imperfectly and indeed very unnaturally, set forth, if we limit the import of the phrase to A FEDERAL CHANGE OF CONDITION. As touching its proposed definition, the phrase is far too lofty: and, in truth, when thus limited to nothing more than an *Outward Change of Relation to God by a formal and official transfer from the World at large into the pale of the Visible Church Catholic*, it is difficult to discern even its fitness and propriety.

Hence, the very expression of a *Birth from above* or a *Birth from heaven* seems imperiously to require: that we should understand by it, not only *partially*, but even *mainly* and *principally*, A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION wrought by the Holy Ghost in our fallen nature, without which, in the very necessity of things, a man, as our Lord speaks, *cannot*, by reason of his essential unfitness, enter into the kingdom of God.

2. As, then, it is a *Birth from above* or a *Birth from heaven:* so Christ himself distinctly explains his own meaning by calling it a *Birth from the Spirit.*

To bestow, upon a mere Outward Change of Relative Condition, the appellation of a *Birth from the Spirit*, is, I should conceive, absolutely inaccurate and improper: though, from the circumstance of this *Birth from the Spirit* being also and unitedly called a *Birth from Water*, the idea

of such a Change ought obviously to be sub-included.

Hence, therefore, again, by a *Birth from the Spirit*, we must chiefly and properly understand A MORAL OR SPIRITUAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION.

3. The *Moral Birth from the Spirit* is, directly and avowedly, contrasted with the *Physical Birth from the flesh*.

That, which is born of the flesh, is flesh: and that, which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.

But the contrast altogether vanishes, if we limit the sense of the phrase to a mere Outward Change of Relative Condition: for it is hard to say, how a person, declared to be *only* born outwardly into the Church, and *not* born morally or spiritually by an essential Change of Disposition, can, in point of character, accord with the words, *That which is born of the Spirit is spirit*.

4. This same *Birth from above* or *Birth from the Spirit* is compared to the unrestricted blowing of the wind, when we hear its sound, but cannot tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth.

Such a comparison is perfectly applicable, if it be understood as relating to A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION: which, without *our* being able definitely to fix the *mode*, is mysteriously produced by the good Spirit of God; and which is known only by its perceptible *effect* upon the principles and the conduct.

But it is altogether inapplicable, if it be understood as exclusively relating to A MERE FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION: which, instrumentally and visibly and sensibly, is produced by the administration of Baptism.

For, of the Inward Moral Change, we may truly say: that we can tell, neither whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth; inasmuch as, like the wind, it eludes all direct cognizance.

But, of the Outward Federal Change, we may no less truly say: that, with perfect ease, we can tell both the one and the other; for it cometh from Baptism, and it goeth to an admission into the Visible Church Catholic.

Hence, finally, the Ideality of Regeneration must embrace, both A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION, and A FEDERAL CHANGE OF CONDITION. It cannot comprise the latter alone, to the exclusion of the former.

II. We may next attend to the language of the Apostle St. John.

*He came unto his own: and his own received him not. But, as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God**.

Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin:

* John i. 11—13.

for God's Seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this, the Children of God are manifest, and the Children of the Devil *.

Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one, that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God †.

Whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the world: and this is the victory, that overcometh the world; even our faith ‡.

To all these passages, one and the same remark is alike applicable.

According to their plain and natural and untortured construction, the Apostle is speaking, not of AN OUTWARD CHANGE OF CONDITION alone, but of AN INWARD MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION.

Now this Moral Change he distinguishes, as a *Birth from God.*

Evidently, therefore, the palmary and leading idea of Regeneration is, according to St. John, that of a *Moral or Spiritual Change of Disposition.*

III. Let us finally hear the words of the Apostle St. Peter.

Seeing ye have purified your souls, in obeying the truth through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren: see, that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible

* 1 John iii. 9, 10. † Ibid iv. 7.

‡ Ibid. v. 4.

Seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever *.

Eight souls were saved by Water. The like figure whereunto, even Baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ †.

Here again, in each of these two passages, we are brought exactly to the same conclusion.

1. With respect to the first of them, a person, who has undergone nothing more than AN OUTWARD CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION effected by the official instrumentality of corruptible Water, can scarcely be said to have been born again of incorruptible, as contradistinguished from corruptible, Seed.

By the ordinary conventional force of language, such a description clearly relates to A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION, springing up, we know not how, from the incorruptible Seed of God's own Spiritual Agency.

Accordingly, the characteristics of the Change, which St. Peter describes as a *Being Born again*, are all purely of a moral nature: *Love of the Brethren;* and *Obedience to the Truth through the Spirit;* and *Purification of the Soul* ‡.

* 1 Peter i. 22, 23. † Ibid. iii. 20, 21.

‡ Archbishop Tillotson, I must needs say, strikes me, as speaking both very scripturally and very rationally on the NATURE of *Conversion and Regeneration:* as, throughout his

2. In like manner, with respect to the second of the two passages, the Baptism, which brings us into the Church as the Waters of the Deluge drove the Noëtic Family into the Ark, saves us,

Treatise, identifying Conversion with Regeneration, he reduplicatively expresses himself.

Regeneration is the Change of a Man's State, from a State of Sin to a State of Holiness: which, because it is an Entrance upon a New Kind or Course of Life, is fitly resembled to Regeneration or a New Birth: to a New Creation, the man being, as it were, quite changed or made over again, so as not to be, as to the main purpose and design of his life, the same man he was before. This is a plain sensible account of the thing, which every one may easily understand. Serm. cix. vol. vi. p. 369.

In thus defining Regeneration to be a *Moral Change of Nature or Disposition by which a man passes from a State of Sin to a State of Holiness,* as contradistinguished from its proposed Restriction to a mere *Federal Change of Relative Condition,* his grace, we may observe, *systematically* uses the term *Regeneration,* in what Bishop Bethell, perhaps a little too hastily, stigmatises as *a more loose and popular way.* General View. chap. i. p. 8. Clearly, the Archbishop himself did not so consider the matter: for, even *ex professo,* he is giving a formal definition of *Regeneration.* It may, no doubt, be *popular:* because, as he remarks, *every one may easily understand it.* But he could not well have meant it to be *loose* or *indefinite:* because he avowedly exhibits it, as *a plain and sensible account of the thing.*

There is another statement in the work of Bishop Bethell, which, with all the due respect to which he is so justly entitled, I may perhaps be here permitted to notice.

In modern times, says he, *we have been taught, that Regeneration is a thing quite unconnected with Baptism: that it may, indeed, take place in that Sacrament, as well as at any*

not by a mere outward putting away of the filth of the flesh, but by its association with such a Birth from above as morally involves the answer of a good conscience toward God.

other time ; but that, to suppose it in any proper sense dependent on it, is an unreasonable and unscriptural opinion. General View. chap. ii. p. 11.

Surely, this is a mistake on the part of the learned Prelate. I never met with at least any member of the Church of England, who taught that *Regeneration is a thing quite unconnected with Baptism:* nor, with the sole exception of the Society of Friends who reject Outward Baptism altogether, am I aware, though I speak under correction, that any such opinion is advocated among Dissenters. The doctrine of the Anglican Divines, whose System I have arranged in my third Class, is : not that Regeneration is *quite unconnected* with Baptism, but only that it is not *inseparably connected* with it. Baptism they hold to be *one* of the divinely appointed means or channels, through which, by the agency of the Good Spirit of God, Moral Regeneration is imparted : but, with Archbishop Tillotson and a chain of Theologians from the Reformation of the English Church down to the present times, they more than doubt, whether it be the *sole* mean or channel ; and thence also they more than doubt, whether the Inward Grace *invariably* accompanies the Outward Sign.

Either from a little feeling of impatience or from some other similar cause, it certainly is a fact, that, not unfrequently, truly good and amiable men first misapprehend and then misrepresent the sentiments of those from whom they have been led to differ. From my acquaintance with him, Dr. Bethell, I am sure, will be the last man to be displeased with my noticing this small inaccuracy. *His* statements carry with them a weight, which the statements of men, inferior in rank and in talent, do *not* carry.

IV. I would not be indecorously dogmatical: yet, as simple words are, by general consent, commonly understood, Scripture seems to determine the true ideality of Regeneration to be: principally, A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION; and thence, subordinately and involvedly, A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION.

CHAPTER III.

THE IDEALITY OF REGENERATION, AS IT MAY BE COLLECTED FROM THE EARLY FATHERS.

Nevertheless, though, in this matter, I really think it well nigh impossible to mistake the meaning of Scripture: yet it cannot be said, that the Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration has been fully set forth, unless we advert also to the received sense of the early Ecclesiastical Writers. I shall next, therefore, inquire: *What, according to the testimony of the more ancient Fathers, is the true Ideality of Regeneration as inculcated by the Church from the beginning.*

My Witnesses to the Doctrine maintained in the Primitive Church may conveniently be divided into two Classes: the first Class comprehending those who intimate, that Regeneration is a *Moral Change of Disposition;* the second Class comprising those who intimate, that Regeneration is not only a *Moral Change of Disposition* but that

yet additionally it is also a *Federal Change of Relative Condition.*

I. Agreeably, then, to such a division, the proposed Delivering of Evidence shall open with the Witnesses of the first Class: or with those Witnesses, who intimate that Regeneration is a *Moral Change of Disposition.*

1. Here, I shall fitly commence with calling up Justin Martyr: a Witness who was converted to Christianity only about thirty years after the death of St. John, and who is specially valuable both from his high antiquity and from the minute particularity of his detail touching the administration of each of the two holy Sacraments.

In what manner, says this primeval writer, *we offer ourselves unto God, after we have been made new creatures through Christ, I shall now explain: lest, if I should pass this over, I should seem to act dishonestly in my narrative.*

Whosoever shall have been persuaded, and shall believe the truth of the matters which by us are taught and propounded, and shall promise that they will live accordingly: these persons are instructed to supplicate God with fasting that their former sins may be forgiven; we ourselves jointly praying and fasting along with them.

Then they are brought by us to a place where there is Water: and they are regenerated, after the fashion of the Regeneration in which we ourselves were regenerated. For, Christ himself

having said, Unless you be born again, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven, they thence undergo the Washing by Water, in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost.—

Now, respecting the principle of this ordinance, we have been thus taught by the Apostles.

Since, without any consciousness of our first generation, we were, of physical necessity and by no free choice of our own, born from the union of our parents; and since, moreover, when born, we were brought up in corruption of manners and in wickedness of conversation: in order that we might not remain children of necessity and unconsciousness, but might become children of freedom and knowledge, obtaining in the Water a remission of our previously committed sins, the name of God, the Father and Lord of all things, is pronounced over him, who has freely made his choice to be regenerated, and who has repented of his past transgressions.—

But this Washing is called ILLUMINATION: *because those, who learn these things, are illuminated as to the understanding. And, furthermore, he, that is illuminated, is washed, in the name of Jesus Christ who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and in the name of the Holy Ghost who through the Prophets foretold all things concerning Jesus.—*

We, then, after having thus washed the convert now enrolled in our number, bring him to those who are called Brethren, even to the place where they

are assembled together, about to make common supplications, on behalf both of themselves and of the newly illuminated and of all others throughout the whole world: that, having learned the truth, we may conduct ourselves accordingly in good living, with the view of our being finally saved in an everlasting salvation. When we cease from prayer, we salute each other with the kiss of charity.

Then, to the President of the Brethren, there is brought bread along with a cup of water and mingled wine: and he, having received them, offers up praise and glory, to the Father of all things, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; and he abundantly makes a thanksgiving, moreover, that, on the part of God, we should have been deemed worthy of these things. And, when he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present assent by uttering the word Amen. And then certain persons, whom we call Deacons, give, to each one present, a portion of the bread and wine and water, over which thanksgiving has been offered up, that he may be a partaker: and they carry some likewise to those who are absent. But this food is called by us the Eucharist: and no one is allowed to partake of it, save the person, who believes our doctrines to be true, and who has been washed with Baptism for the remission of sins and in order to his Regeneration, and who lives as Christ hath commanded *.

* Ὃν τρόπον δὲ καὶ ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ, καινοποιήθεντες,

2. The next Witness that I shall summon is Clement of Alexandria, who flourished some fifty years later than Justin.

διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐξηγησόμεθα· ὅπως μὴ, τοῦτο παραλίποντες, δόξωμεν πονηρεύειν τὶ ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει.

Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βιοῦν οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται· εὔχεσθαι τε καὶ αἰτεῖν, νηστεύοντες, παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημάτων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς.

Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστι· καὶ, τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται· ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν, Ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.—

Καὶ λόγον δὲ εἰς τοῦτο, παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἐμάθομεν τοῦτον.

Ἐπείδη, τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν ἡμῶν ἀγνοοῦντες, κατ' ἀνάγκην γεγεννήμεθα ἐξ ὑγρᾶς σπορᾶς κατὰ μίξιν τὴν τῶν γονέων πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ ἐν ἔθεσι φαύλοις καὶ πονηραῖς ἀνατροφαῖς γεγόναμεν· ὅπως μὴ ἀνάγκης τέκνα μηδὲ ἀγνοίας μένωμεν, ἀλλὰ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης· ἀφέσεως τε ἁμαρτιῶν, ὑπὲρ ὧν προημάρτομεν, τύχωμεν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι ἐπονομάζεται τῷ ἑλομένῳ ἀναγεννηθῆναι καὶ μετανοήσαντι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις, τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότου Θεοῦ ὄνομα.—

Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν ΦΩΤΙΣΜΟΣ, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διανοίαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων. Καὶ, ἐπ' ὀνόματος δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρώθεντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος Πνεύματος Ἁγίου ὁ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν προεκήρυξε τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν πάντα, ὁ φωτιζόμενος λούεται.—

Ἡμεῖς δὲ, μετὰ τὸ οὕτως λοῦσαι τὸν πεπεισμενον καὶ συγκατατεθείμενον, ἐπὶ τοὺς λεγομένους Ἀδελφοὺς ἄγομεν ἔνθα συνήγμενοι εἰσι, κοινὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόμενοι ὑπὲρ τε ἑαυτῶν καὶ τοῦ φωτίσθεντος καὶ ἄλλων πανταχοῦ πάντων εὐτόνως· ὅπως καταξιωθῶμεν, τὰ ἀληθῆ μάθοντες, καὶ δι' ἔργων ἀγαθοὶ πολιτευταὶ καὶ φύλακες τῶν ἐντεταλμένων εὑρεθῆναι,

This one grace appertains to Illumination: that the manners and habits of the person illuminated

ὅπως τὴν αἰώνιον σωτηρίαν σωθῶμεν. Ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα, παυσάμενοι τῶν εὐχῶν.

Ἔπειτα προσφέρεται, τῷ Προεστῶτι τῶν Ἀδελφῶν, ἄρτος καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος. Καὶ οὗτος, λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου, ἀναπέμπει· καὶ εὐχαριστίαν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται. Οὗ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ, λέγων Ἀμήν. Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Προεστῶτος, καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν Διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστήθεντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι. Καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν Εὐχαρίστια· ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχεῖν ἐξὸν ἐστιν, ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ δεδιδάγμενα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, καὶ λουσαμένῳ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρὸν, καὶ οὕτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς παρέδωκεν. Justin. Apol. i. Oper. p. 73, 74, 76.

I have been compelled to lengthen this citation beyond what was necessary for my immediate purpose, in order that the sense might not be left incomplete. Justin, at the commencement, professes his intention to shew, with perfect honesty and exactness, how the Primitive Christians offered themselves to God after they had been made new creatures through Christ. But the *mode* of this self-oblation he shews in his *subsequent* account of their celebration of the Eucharist. So far as appears from Justin, the *only* Sacrifice, acknowledged by the Early Church in the Lord's Supper, was, as our own Liturgy well expresses it, the two-fold sacrifice, of *Praise and Thanksgiving* on the one hand, and on the other hand, the *offering of both Soul and Body unto God to be a reasonable holy and lively sacrifice unto him:* unless, indeed, we choose to give the name of a *sacrifice* to the devout Oblation of the Bread and Wine, *in order to*, not *in consequence of*, their consecration; as men-

should no longer be the same, as they were before he was washed in Baptism.*

A woman who plays the harlot, is alive indeed unto sin, but is dead unto the commandments. Yet, when she has repented, inasmuch as she has been born again according to the Conversion of her life, she possesses the Regeneration of vitality †.

He, that is born again in the Spirit and not from blood or from the will of the flesh, must forsake,

tioned by Justin's partial contemporary Irenèus. It is further observable, that in Justin's professedly honest account, not a syllable is said respecting any *Prayers being offered up for the Dead.* This was the extrascriptural superstition of a *later* age: and, accordingly, when the eucharistic liturgies were first committed to writing in the fourth and fifth centuries, we find it universally introduced into them. But the total silence of Justin, when professing the honesty of special correctness, fatally shews, that no such idle and presumptuous will-worship existed in the uncorrupted *primeval* liturgies of the Church.

* Μία χάρις αὕτη τοῦ Φωτίσματος, τὸ μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, τῷ πρὶν ἢ λούσασθαι, τὸν τρόπον. Clem. Alex. Pædag. lib. i. c. 6. Oper. p. 95.

† Ἡ γὰρ τοι πορνεύσασα, ζῇ μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀπέθανεν δὲ ταῖς ἐντολαῖς· ἡ δὲ μετανοήσασα, οἷον ἀναγεννηθεῖσα κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν τοῦ βίου, παλιγγενεσίαν ἔχει ζωῆς. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. ii. Oper. p. 425.

Agreeably to the requirement of the context, I translate οἷον ἀναγεννηθεῖσα, not quasi *regenerata* or *born again as it were*, but *quippe quæ sit regenerata* or *inasmuch as she has been born again.*

The phrase is not catachrestical, as if Clement wished only to say, that the penitent woman was *in some sort* born again, though the expression was *really* inaccurate and *therefore* im-

not only the idols which he previously worshipped as gods, but likewise the works of his former life *.

3. As a third Witness, I shall call up Tertullian, the contemporary of Clement of Alexandria.

Happy is the Sacrament of Water: because, when the sins of our former blindness have been washed away, we are liberated into eternal life.—Thus man, who had formerly been created after the image of God, will be restored to God according to his similitude.—For he receives that Spirit of God, whom by his breathing into him he had received at his first creation, but whom he afterward had lost through sin †.

4. My fourth Witness shall be Cyprian, who lived about fifty years later than Clement and Tertullian.

proper: but it expresses the *actuality* of a Regeneration, which she had never before experienced.

The latin translation, which I suppose to be that of Sylburgius, is here perfectly correct.

Quæ autem ducta est poenitentia, *ut quæ sit regenerata* per vitæ conversionem, habet vitæ regenerationem.

* Δεῖ γὰρ, οὐ τὰ εἴδωλα μόνον καταλιπεῖν ἃ πρότερον ἐξεθείαζεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ προτέρου βίου, τὸν, οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐν θελήματος σαρκὸς, ἐν Πνεύματι δὲ, ἀναγεννώμενον. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. ii. Oper. p. 386.

† Felix sacramentum aquæ nostræ: quia, ablutis delictis pristinæ cæcitatis, in vitam æternam liberamur.—Ita restituetur homo Deo ad similitudinem ejus, qui retro ad imaginem Dei fuerat.—Recipit enim illum Dei Spiritum, quem tunc de afflatu ejus acceperat, sed post amiserat per delictum. Tertull. de Baptism. Oper. p. 703, 705.

This Witness expresses the sense of the Primitive Church with remarkable fulness: and, what adds a special value to his testimony, he describes his own personal reception of Regeneration.

When I lay in darkness and in the very night of blindness; and when, in the sea of the agitating world, unsettled and dubious, I fluctuated with wandering footsteps, ignorant of my true life, alienated from verity and light: I thought it, according to my then manners, a specially difficult and hard thing, which the divine indulgence promised to me in order to my salvation; namely, that any one could be born again; and that, being animated to a new life through the Laver of Salutary Water, he could lay aside that which he had previously been; and that, while the whole frame of the body remained unaltered, he could change the entire man in mind and disposition.

How, said I, is so great a Conversion possible: that, what has either grown hard by the very quality of its natural matter, or through long habit has become absolutely inveterate, should suddenly and rapidly be thrown off? Surely these matters are inherently fixed and deeply rooted. When shall he, who has been accustomed to splendid banquets and to profuse dainties, learn a sober economy? And when shall he, who has shone conspicuous in costly robes and gold and purple, let himself down to plebeian and simple raiment? The man, who is delighted with official pomp and public honours, can-

not submit to the ingloriousness of a private station: and he, who is used to a train of fawning clients and obsequious followers, will deem solitude a heavy punishment. It must needs be, that, as usual, with their ever tenacious allurements, wine should invite, pride inflate, anger inflame, rapacity disquiet, cruelty stimulate, ambition delight, lust precipitate.

Thus spoke I often within myself: for, as I was held firmly bound by the innumerable errors of my former life, from which I believed not that I could ever be disengaged; so, in truth, I was even seconding my inherent vices, and, through a despair of better things, I was favouring my evil propensities as if they were specially my own vernacular property. But, after a light from above had infused itself into my expiated and purified bosom, when the stain of my former life was washed out by the aid of the Regenerative Water; and after a Second Nativity had re-created me into a new man, when the Spirit from heaven had been drawn in: then, in a wonderful manner, the doubtful seemed immediately to receive confirmation; the recondite, to lie open; the dark, to become luminous; the difficult, to be made easy; the impossible, to be rendered possible; the carnal, to be acknowledged earthly; the animation communicated by the Holy Spirit, to be felt as the commencement of God's work. You yourself well know and equally recognise, what that Death of my Sins, and that Life of my Virtues,

took away from me on the one hand, and added to me on the other hand. You yourself know it, for I am not the trumpeter of my own commendation. Boasting is odious: though, indeed, whatsoever is not ascribed to the virtue of man, but is set forth as proceeding from the bounty of God, must be a matter of gratitude, and cannot be a matter of boasting; so that abstinence from sin now began to be ascribed to Faith, though the former practice of sin had been placed only to the account of human error. From God, I say, from God, is every thing which we are able to do. Thence we live: thence we flourish: thence our whole vigour being received and derived, we presage, from our present position, an indication of things future.*

* Ego, cum in tenebris atque in nocte cæca jaceram; cumque in salo jactantis seculi, nutabundus ac dubius, vestigiis oberrantibus fluctuarem; vitæ meæ nescius, veritatis ac lucis alienus: difficile prorsus ac durum, pro illis tunc moribus, opinabar, quod in salutem mihi divina indulgentia pollicebatur; ut quis renasci denuo posset; utque, in novam vitam lavacro aquæ salutaris animatus, quod prius fuerat exponeret; et, corporis licet manente compage, hominem animo ac mente mutaret.

Qui possibilis, aiebam, *est tanta conversio: ut repente ac perniciter exuatur, quod vel genuinum situ materiæ naturalis obduruit, vel usurpatum diu senio vetustatis inolevit? Alta hæc: et, profunda penitus radice, sederunt. Quando parcimonium discit, qui epularibus coenis et largis dapibus assuerit? Et, qui pretiosa vaste conspicuus in auro atque in purpura fulsit, ad plebeium se ac simplicem cultum quando deponit? Fascibus ille oblectatus et honoribus, privatus et inglorius esse*

5. Exactly correspondent, at the close of the third century, is the language of Lactantius:

non potest. Hic, stipatus clientium cuneis, frequentiore comitatu officiosi agminis honestatus, pœnam putat esse cum solus est. Tenacibus semper illecebris, necesse est, ut solebat, vinolentia invitet, inflat superbia, iracundia inflammet, rapacitas inquietet, crudelitas stimulet, ambitio delectat, libido præcipitet.

Hæc egomet sæpe mecum: nam, ut ipse quamplurimis vitæ prioris erroribus implicitus tenebar, quibus exui me posse non crederem; sic vitiis adhærentibus obsecundans eram, et, desperatione meliorum, malis meis, veluti jam propriis ac vernaculis, favebam. Sed, postquam, undæ genitalis auxilio superioris ævi labe detersa, in expiatum pectus ac purum, desuper se lumen infudit; postquam coelitus Spiritu hausto, in novum me hominem nativitas secunda reparavit: mirum in modum, protinus confirmare se dubia, patere clausa, lucere tenebrosa; facultatem dare, quod prius difficile videbatur; geri posse, quod impossibile putabatur ut esset; agnoscere terrenum fuisse, quod prius carnaliter natum delictis obnoxium viveret: Dei esse coepissa, quod jam Spiritus Sanctus animaret. Scis ipse profecto, et mecum pariter recognoscis, quid detraxerit nobis, quidve contulerit, mors ista criminum, vita virtutum. Scis ipse, nec prædico in proprias laudationes: odiosa jactatio est; quamvis non jactatum possit esse sed gratum, quicquid non virtuti hominis adscribitur, sed de Dei munere prædicatur; ut jam non peccare esse coeperit fidei, quod ante peccatum est fuerit erroris humani. Dei est, inquam, Dei, omne quod possumus. Inde vivimus: inde pollemus: inde, sumto et concepto vigore, hic adhuc positi futurorum indicia prænoscimus. Cyprian. ad Donat. de Gratia Dei. Oper. vol. i. p. 2, 3.

With much the same ideality, Ambrose views Regeneration as a Resurrection from Spiritual Death. Whence, of course, he must have deemed it a Moral Change.

Quid est Regeneratio? — Ergo Resurrectio quid est, nisi

who may justly, therefore, appear as my fifth Witness.

Give me a man, who is passionate, abusive, unbridled: with a few words of God, I will make him as mild as a lamb. Give me one, who is exacting, avaricious, tenacious: I will return him to you liberal and with full hands a dispenser of his wealth. Give me one, who fears pain and death: he shall presently despise both the cross and the fire and the infuriated bull. Give me a libertine, an adulterer, a fornicator: you shall forthwith see him sober, chaste, continent. Give me a man, who is cruel and blood-thirsty: that fury of his shall soon be changed into true clemency. Give me one addicted to injustice, folly, sin: he shall immediately become just and prudent and innocent. In the single Laver of Regeneration, all his wickedness shall be abolished *.

quando de morte ad vitam resurgimus? Sic ergo et in Baptismate, quoniam similitudo mortis est, sine dubio, dum mergis et resurgis, similitudo fit Resurrectionis. Rectè itaque, secundum interpretationem Apostoli Petri, sicut illa Resurrectio Regeneratio fuit, ita et ista Resurrectio Regeneratio est. Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iii. c. 1. Oper. vol. ii. col. 361.

* Da mihi virum, qui sit iracundus, maledicus, effrenatus: paucisque Dei verbis tam placidum, quam ovem, reddam. Da cupidum, avarum, tenacem: jam tibi eum liberalem dabo, et pecuniam suam plenis manibus largientem. Da timidum doloris ac mortis: jam cruces, et ignes, taurum, contemnet. Da libidinosum, adulterum, ganeonem: jam sobrium, castum, continentem, videbis. Da crudelem et sanguinis appetentem: jam

6. The sixth Witness that I shall call up is Athanasius, who flourished about the middle of the fourth century.

He, that is baptised, puts off the Old Man: and, as being born from above, is renewed by the grace of the Spirit.*

7. As my seventh Witness, I shall summon Cyril of Jerusalem, who, in the same fourth century, prior to his episcopal elevation, held the public office of Catechist.

They, who yet remain in the perverseness of their sins, shall be placed on the left hand, because they attained not to the grace of God which is given through Christ in the Regeneration of Baptism. I speak not of the mere Regeneration of their Bodies: I am speaking of the Spiritual Regeneration of the Soul †.

8. Somewhat later, but still to the same purpose, we find Jerome theologising. Hence I

in veram clementiam furor ille mutabitur. Da injustum, insipientem, peccatorem: continuo, et æquus, et prudens, et innocens, erit. Uno enim lavacro malitia omnis abolebitur. Lactant. Instit. lib. iii. c. 26. p. 328, 329.

* Ὁ δὲ βαπτιζόμενος τὸν μὲν παλαιὸν ἀπεκδιδύσκεται· ανακαινίζεται δὲ, ὡς ἄνωθεν γεννηθεὶς, τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτι. Athan. in Illud Evan. Quicunque dixerit. Oper. vol. i. p. 767.

† Οἷς γὰρ ἔτι τὸ τραχὺ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν περίκειται, οὗτοι ἐν τοῖς ἀριστεροῖς τυγχάνουσι, διὰ τὸ μὴ προσελθεῖν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτι τῇ δοθείσῃ διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ λουτροῦ ἀναγεννήσει· ἀναγέννησιν δὲ οὐ σωμάτων λέγω, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς τὴν πνευματικὴν ἀναγέννησιν. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. i. p. 2.

shall invite him to appear as my eighth Witness.

If any one has received only that Washing, which is of the body and which is seen by the eyes of the flesh, he hath not put on the Lord Jesus Christ *.

9. My ninth and last Witness of this first class shall be Augustine, the contemporary of Jerome.

One thing is the Water of the Sacrament: another thing, the Water which signifies the Spirit of God. The Water of the Sacrament is visible: the Water of the Spirit is invisible. The one washes the Body, and signifies that which is performed in the Soul: through the other, which is the Spirit, the very Soul itself is cleansed and fattened †.

II. I shall next call up my Witnesses of the second class: who, frequently mingling the two ideas together, intimate, that Regeneration is not only a *Moral Change of Disposition*, but that yet additionally it is also a *Federal Change of Condi-*

* Si quis hoc corporeum, et quod oculis carnis inspicitur, aquæ tantum accepit lavacrum, non est indutus Dominum Jesum Christum. Hieron. Comment. in Galat. iii. 27. Oper. vol. vi. p. 137.

† Aliud est, ergo, aqua sacramenti: aliud, aqua quæ significat Spiritum Dei. Aqua sacramenti visibilis est: aqua Spiritus, invisibilis. Ista abluit corpus, et significat quod fit in anima: per illum Spiritum, ipsa anima mundatur et saginatur. August. Expos. in Epist. Joan. i. 4. Tractat. vi. Oper. vol. ix. p. 224.

tion by which we obtain the covenanted privileges of Remission of Sins and Incorporation into the Visible Church and Adoption of Sonship.

1. On this point, we may first hear the testimony of Justin.

In order that we might not remain children of necessity and unconsciousness, but might become children of freedom and knowledge, obtaining in the Water a Remission of our previously committed Sins, the name of God, the Father and Lord of all things, is pronounced over him, who has freely made his choice to be regenerated, and who has repented of his past transgressions *.

2. Next, we may attend to the statement of Tertullian.

Unless a person be born of Water and the Spirit, he shall not go into the kingdom of God: that is, he shall not be holy. Thus every soul is accounted to be in Adam, until it is reaccounted to be in Christ †.

3. Next, we may listen to Clement of Alexandria.

* Ὅπως μὴ ἀνάγκης τέκνα μηδὲ ἀγνοίας μένωμεν, ἀλλὰ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης· ἀφέσεως τε ἁμαρτιῶν, ὑπὲρ ὧν προημάρτομεν, τύχωμεν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι· ἐπονομάζεται τῷ ἑλομένῳ ἀναγεννηθῆναι καὶ μετανοήσαντι ἐπὶ τοῖς προημαρτημένοις, τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότου Θεοῦ ὄνομα. Justin. Apol. i. Oper. p. 74.

† Meminerat dominicæ definitionis, *Nisi quis nascatur ex aqua et Spiritu, non introibit in regnum Dei*: id est, non erit sanctus. Ita omnis anima eousque in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recensentur. Tertull. de Anim. Oper. p. 674.

This work is distinguished by various different names: such as, the FREE GIFT, *and* ILLUMINATION, *and* INITIATION, *and* BAPTISM. *It is called* BAPTISM *or* WASHING; *because, through it, we wash away our sins: the* FREE GIFT; *because, through it, the just punishment due to sin is remitted:* ILLUMINATION; *because, through it, the holy and saving Light is beheld, that is, through it, we clearly behold the Deity:* INITIATION; *because, through it, we declare, that nothing is wanting* *.

4. After Clement, we may hear Cyprian.

We, who, the Lord permitting, gave to believers only the first Baptism, may well be preparing each individual to another Baptism. For we may fitly insinuate and teach: that this Baptism of Martyrdom is greater in grace, in potency more sublime, in honour more precious. It is the Baptism, in which angels are the baptisers: the Baptism, in which God and his Christ exult: the Baptism, after which no one ever sins again: the Baptism, which consummates the increase of our Faith: the Baptism, which, when we recede from this world, immediately unites us to God. In the Baptism of

* Καλεῖται δὲ πολλαχῶς τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο, Χάρισμα, καὶ Φώτισμα, καὶ Τέλειον, καὶ Λουτρὸν. Λουτρὸν μὲν, δι' οὗ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀπορ-ρυπτόμεθα· Χάρισμα δε, ᾧ τὰ ἐπὶ τοὶς ἁμαρτήμασιν ἐπιτίμια ἀνεῖται· Φώτισμα δὲ, δι' οὗ τὸ ἅγιον ἐκεῖνο φῶς σωτήριον ἐποπτεύεται, τουτέστιν, δι' οὗ τὸ Θεῖον ὀξυωποῦμεν· Τέλειον δὲ, τὸ ἀπροσδεὲς φαμὲν. Clem. Alex. Pædag. lib. i. c. 6. Oper. 93.

Water, the Remission of Sins is received: in the Baptism of Blood, the Crown of Virtues *.

5. Next, we may listen to Athanasius.

Holy Baptism purifies us from all Hereditary Sin †.

6. From Athanasius, we may proceed to the Catechist Cyril of Jerusalem.

Great is the Baptism, which now lies before you: a Ransom to the Captives; a Remission of Offences; the Death of Sin; the Regeneration of the Soul; the Shining Vestment; the Holy and Indissoluble Seal; the Chariot to Heaven; the Delight of Paradise; the Procurer of the Kingdom; the Free Gift of the Adoption of Sons ‡.

* Nos tantum qui, Domino permittente, primum baptisma credentibus dedimus, ad aliud quoque singulos præparemus: insinuantes et docentes, hoc esse baptisma, in gratia majus, in potestate sublimius, in honore pretiosius; baptisma, in quo angeli baptizant; baptisma, in quo Deus et Christus ejus exultant; baptisma, post quod nemo jam peccat; baptisma, quod fidei nostræ incrementa consummat; baptisma, quod nos, de mundo recedentes, statim Deo copulat. In aquæ baptismo, accipitur peccatorum remissa: in sanguinis, corona virtutum. Cyprian. de Exhort. Martyr. Oper. vol. i. p. 168, 169.

† Ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν πιστῶν τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας προπατορικῆς. Athan. Quæst. ad Antioch. quæst. lxvi. Oper. vol. ii. p. 291.

‡ Μέγα τὸ προκείμενον βάπτισμα· αἰχμαλώτοις, λύτρον· ἁμαρτημάτων, ἄφεσις· θάνατος, ἁμαρτίας· παλιγγενέσια, ψυχῆς· ἔνδυμα φωτεινὸν· σφράγις ἁγία ἀκατάλυτος· ὄχημα πρὸς οὐρανόν· παραδείσου τρυφὴ· βασιλείας πρόξενον· υἱοθεσίας χάρισμα. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. in Proëm. p. viii.

7. Next, we may hear Jerome.

Man is conceived and born in original sin, which is derived from Adam: but, through the grace of Christ, he is purified by Baptism.*

When, in Baptism, the Remission of Sins is freely bestowed; then Sins are, by men, amputated and execrated†.

8. Finally, we may listen to the statements of Augustine, who, perhaps more fully than other of the Ancients, has been led to treat of Baptism and Regeneration.

The matter must thus be understood: namely, that, by the same Washing of Regeneration and Word of Sanctification, all the ills of regenerated man are cleansed and healed; that is to say, not only the sins which are all now remitted in Baptism, but even those which through human ignorance and infirmity are afterward contracted‡.

* Concipitur autem et nascitur in originali peccato, quod ex Adam trahitur: sed baptismo, per gratiam Christi, purificatur. Hieron. Comment. in Psalm. li. 5. Oper. vol. vii. p. 63.

† Amputantur enim et execrantur ab hominibus peccata, cum in baptismo donatur remissio peccatorum. Hieron. in Cant. Homil. iv. Oper. vol. viii. p. 157.

‡ Sic, inquam, accipiendum est: ut, eodem lavacro regenerationis et verbo sanctificationis, omnia prorsus mala hominum regeneratorum mundentur atque sanentur, non solum peccata quæ omnia nunc remittuntur in Baptismo, sed etiam quæ posterius humana ignorantia vel infirmitate contrahuntur. August. de Nupt. et Concupis. lib. ii. c. 33. Oper. vol. vii. p. 313.

Those, who are washed in the Laver of holy Regeneration, have received the forgiveness of all their sins *.

When little children are baptised, no less a thing is done, than that they are incorporated into the Church: in other words, that they are associated with the body and members of Christ †.

* Lavacro sanctæ regenerationis abluti, universorum remissionem acceperunt peccatorum. August de Civit. Dei. lib. i. c. 27. Oper. vol. v. p. 14.

† Nihil agitur aliud, cum parvuli baptizantur, nisi ut incorporentur Ecclesiæ: id est, Christi corpori membrisque socientur. August. de Peccat. Merit. et Remiss. cont. Pelagian. lib. iii. c. 4. Oper. vol. vii. p. 274.

CHAPTER IV.

REMARKS ON THE TESTIMONY BORNE BY THE EARLY FATHERS.

After hearing this two-fold Testimony, each division of which is propounded by the same individual Witnesses, so that they may be viewed as themselves explaining and amplifying their own meaning, we can scarcely, I think, mistake the Ideality of Regeneration as inculcated by the Primitive Church: and as little can we mistake the use which was made of that Ideality when inculcated.

I. In exact accordance with what has been gathered from Scripture, the Ancients held and taught: that, properly and principally, Regeneration is a *Moral Change of Disposition*. But, at the same time, what indeed is inherent in the very notion of such a Change, they likewise held and taught, that, secondarily and consecutively, Regeneration is also a *Federal Change of Condition*.

1. By this *Moral Change of Disposition*, they understood, what was rendered necessary by the Fall, an *Entire Spiritual Change in the Inner Man:* through which, his soul is altogether renovated; through which, new principles and new affections are, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, implanted; through which, the whole individual, both in purpose and in practice, is converted from evil to good; through which, finally, the subject of such a Change is brought out of apostate darkness into God's marvellous light.

According to *their* apprehension, in short, the Change, imported by the term *Regeneration*, was such and so great: that the irritable became meek; the avaricious, liberal; the timid, courageous even unto Martyrdom; the intemperate and unchaste, sober and continent; the cruel, clement; the unjust, just and prudent and innocent.

2. So, again, by this *Federal Change of Condition*, they broadly understood the *Translation of a Man, from his natural or exträ̈ecclesiastical state in fallen Adam, to an acquired or inträ̈ecclesiastical State in Christ the second Adam.* In other words, they understood by it a *Translation, from the uncovenanted Condition of the fallen World at large, to the covenanted Condition of the associated and enrolled members of Christ's Visible Church.*

Such a Translation, being in its very nature *federal*, as importing a two-fold stipulation; a stipulation, that is to say, on the part of God, and

a corresponding stipulation on the part of man: such a Translation communicated a covenanted right and title to all the benefits and privileges of the Gospel Dispensation, whensoever the baptised person, acting up to his baptismal promises, should thus put in his claim to those stipulated benefits and privileges.

These, in the apprehension of the Ancients, are: the Remission of Sin; the Adoption into the Family of God; a State of purchased Salvability; and a Covenanted Right to Eternal Happiness.

To all such privileges, whether in point of *fact* hereafter claimed or not claimed, a Federal Title was thought to be secured and officially ratified in the Laver of Regeneration.

II. Still, in order that the System might be rendered complete, a specification of that, through which, ultimately and meritoriously, fallen man, by the appointed instrumentality of Baptism, obtains a Covenanted Right to Everlasting Happiness and to every preparatory Blessing and Privilege, was plainly necessary and essential.

This, accordingly, was acknowledged to be the *Perfect Meritoriousness of Christ, operating in the all-potent Efficacy of the Blood of Atonement.*

Hence Ambrose, commenting upon the words of St. John in his first Epistle, duly combines the two ideas of a *Moral Change* and a *Federal Change*

with yet a third idea: that of the *Price paid for our Redemption.*

The Spirit, says he, *renews the Mind: the Water profits to Cleansing: the Blood respects the Price. For, by adoption, the Spirit makes us the Sons of God: the Water of the Sacred Fountain washes us from the imputed Guilt of Sin: and the Blood of the Lord redeems us* *.

III. But, though the idea of a *Moral Change of Disposition* involves, as its consequence, the idea of a *Federal Change of Condition:* the reverse of the proposition does not thence, of necessity, by any means follow.

Accordingly, the Ancients taught: that, without partaking of that primary part of Regenera-

* Alibi quoque, ut hoc de Sancto Spiritu scripsisse se idem Evangelista reseraret: *Per aquam,* inquit, *et Spiritum, venit Christus Jesus; non solum in aqua, sed per aquam et sanguinem. Et Spiritus testimonium dicit, quoniam Spiritus est Veritas. Quia tres sunt testes; Spiritus, Aqua, Sanguis: et hi tres unum sunt.*

Audi, quomodo testes.

Spiritus Mentem renovat: Aqua proficit ad lavacrum: Sanguis spectat ad pretium. Spiritus enim nos, per adoptionem, filios Dei fecit: Sacri Fontis Unda nos abluit: Sanguis Domini nos redemit.

Alterum, igitur, invisibile, alterum visibile testimonium, Sacramento consequimur spiritali: quia *Spiritus testimonium reddit spiritui nostro.* Etsi, in utroque, plenitudo sit Sacramenti; distinctio tamen muneris est. Ergo, ubi distinctio est muneris, non est utique testificationis æqualitas. Ambros. de Spirit. Sanct. lib. iii. c. 10. § 67, 68. Oper. vol. ii. col. 678.

tion which consists of a *Moral Change of Disposition*, a man, through the ordinary channel of Baptism, might be admitted to that secondary part which consists of a *Federal Change of Condition*.

This belief led, on the part of the early writers, to a corresponding phraseology.

Under *one* aspect, all, who, through Baptism, had been admitted to a *Federal Change of Condition*, were said to have been regenerated: while, under *another* aspect, Regeneration was denied to have been communicated to any, save those who had also experienced a *Moral Change of Disposition*.

Hence, as if Baptism were a *Double Sacrament*, intended to convey a *two-fold* New Birth Federal and Moral, we find the necessity of being born again from *each* Sacrament, namely Water and the Spirit, strongly insisted upon by Cyprian: and hence, what is specially remarkable as it decidedly confirms this view of the matter; we find, even by the same author, Augustine to wit, the Regeneration of Simon Magus at once asserted and denied.

A few citations, when viewed connectedly with the preceding testimonies, will distinctly shew us, how the double Ideality of Regeneration was managed by the early ecclesiastical writers.

1. On this matter, the venerable Cyprian shall first be heard.

Persons may then at length be fully sanctified and thus may become the sons of God, if they are born again from EACH *Sacrament: inasmuch as it is written; Unless a man be born again of* WATER *and the* SPIRIT, *he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. For also, in the Acts of the Apostles, we find, that this was guarded by the Apostles, and was preserved by the truth of salutary Faith: that, when, in the house of Cornelius the Centurion, the Holy Spirit had descended upon the heathens who were there present, fervent in the warmth of Faith and with their whole heart believing in the Lord, so that, filled by him, they blessed God in diverse tongues; the blessed Apostle Peter, nevertheless, mindful of the Gospel and the Divine Precept, commanded, that those very persons, who had already been filled with the* HOLY SPIRIT, *should yet be* BAPTISED: *in order that, in the authoritative apostolic preservation of every part of the Divine Precept and the Law of the Gospel, nothing might seem to be omitted*.*

* Tunc demum planè sanctificari, et esse filii Dei, possunt, si sacramento utroque nascantur, cum scriptum sit: *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex Aqua et Spiritu, non potest introire in regnum Dei.* Invenimus enim etiam, in Actis Apostolorum, hoc esse ab Apostolis custoditum, et salutaris fidei veritate servatum: ut, cum, in domo Cornelii Centurionis, super ethnicos qui illic aderant, fidei calore ferventes, et in Dominum toto corde credentes, descendisset Spiritus Sanctus, quo adimpleti variis linguis Deum benedicerent, nihilominus tamen, beatum Apostolum Petrum, divini præcepti atque evangelii memorem, præcepisse,

2. Next, let Cyril of Jerusalem be called forth.

If thou remained in an evil choice, he, that speaketh unto thee, is blameless: but expect not thou to receive grace. The WATER, *indeed, will accept thee: but the* SPIRIT *will not accept thee*.*

Simon Magus approached to the Washing. He was BAPTISED: *but he was not* ILLUMINATED. *His body, indeed, he baptised with* WATER: *but he illuminated not his heart with the* SPIRIT. *His body descended, and ascended: but his soul was not buried along with Christ, nor was it raised again with him†.*

3. After Cyril, Jerome shall be invited to speak.

It is written: Unless a man be born again of WATER *and the* HOLY SPIRIT, *he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. There are many Washings, which heathens use in their Mysteries and which heretics promise to communicate: for all these*

ut baptizarentur iidem illi qui jam fuerant Sancto Spiritu pleni: ut nihil prætermissum videretur, quo minus per omnia divini præcepti atque evangelii legem, apostolica magisteria servarent. Cyprian. Epist. lxxii. Oper. vol. ii. p. 196, 197.

* Εἰ δὲ ἐπιμένῃς κακῇ προαιρεσε, ὁ μὲν λέγων ἀναίτιος, σὺ δὲ μὴ προσδόκα λήψεσθαι τὴν χάριν. Τὸ μέν γὰρ ὕδωρ σὲ δέξεται· τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα οὐ δέξεται. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. in Proëm. p. iii.

† Προσῆλθε πότε καὶ Σίμων τῷ λουτρῷ ὁ μάγος· ἐβαπτίσθη, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐφωτίσθη. Καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα ἔβαψεν ὕδατι· τὴν δὲ καρδίαν οὐκ ἐφώτισε Πνεύματι. Καὶ κατέβε μὲν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἀνέβη· ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ οὐ συνετάφη χριστῷ, οὐδὲ συνηγέρθη. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. in Proëm. p. i, ii.

wash; but they wash not unto salvation. Now, in the way of application, this may be understood, not only of heretics, but also of those members of the Church, who receive not, with full Faith, salutary Baptism. Of these it must be said: that they received the WATER *indeed, but did not receive the* SPIRIT. *Such was the case of Simon Magus, who would fain have purchased the grace of God with money. He was baptised, indeed, in the* WATER: *but he was, in no wise, baptised unto* SALVATION *.

4. Lastly, that great doctor Augustine shall deliver his sentiments, or rather, I may say, the sentiments of the entire Catholic Church.

To the Inclosed Garden and to the Sealed Well, Simon Magus, whom we read to have been baptised by Philip, might approach. Those numerous dissemblers might also approach, concerning whom, with many groans, speaks Cyprian: They renounced the world, in words alone, and not in deeds. And

* Scriptum est enim: *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex Aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non potest intrare in regnum Dei.* Multaque sunt lavacra, quæ ethnici in mysteriis suis et hæretici pollicentur: qui omnes lavant, sed non lavant in salutem. Propterea additum est: *Et in aqua non es lota in salutem.* Quod quidem, non solum de hæreticis, sed de ecclesiasticis, intelligi potest, qui non plena fide accipiunt baptismum salutarem. De quibus dicendum est, quod acceperint Aquam, sed non acceperint Spiritum: sicut et Simon ille Magus, qui pecunia volebat redimere gratiam Dei, baptizatus quidem est in Aqua, sed nequaquam baptizatus est in Salutem. Hieron. Comment. in Ezek. xvi. 4, 5. Oper. vol. iv. p. 395.

those many avaricious Bishops might also approach, respecting whom the same Cyprian also testifies: They seize upon farms by fraud; and their loans they increase by usury. Such things as these are found, both in the baptised, and in the baptisers, with VISIBLE BAPTISM. *But, to that Appropriated Fountain, in which no alien communicates; to that Sealed Fountain, even the Gift of the* HOLY SPIRIT, *by which the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts: no one of those persons approaches, unless he be morally changed. Of a truth, he must be so universally purified, as to be no longer an alien, but to have become a partaker of heavenly peace, a companion of holy unity, a full recipient of undivided love, a citizen of the angelic city*.*

Not all, whom the Church generates, appertain unto her unity: inasmuch as her unity saves only

* Ad hortum conclusum puteumque signatum potuerit accedere Simon Magus, quem legimus a Philippo baptizatum. Potuerint accedere tot ficti, de quibus gemens loquitur Cyprianus: *Seculo, verbis solis et non factis, renunciantes.* Tot etiam Episcopi avari, de quibus ipse idem testatur: *Fundos insidiosis fraudibus rapientes, usuris multiplicantibus fœnus augentes.* Ista quippe, in baptizatis, et baptizantibus, visibili baptismo, reperiuntur. Ad illum tamen fontem proprium, cui nemo communicat alienus; ad illum fontem signatum, hoc est, ad Spiritus Sancti donum, quo charitas Dei diffunditur in cordibus nostris, nullus istorum, nisi mutatus, accedit; ita omnino mundandus, ut non sit alienus, sed sit cœlestis particeps pacis, sanctæ socius unitatis, plenus individuæ charitatis, civis angelicæ civitatis. August. cont. Crescon. Grammat. lib. ii. c. 15. Oper. vol. vii. p. 156.

such as persevere unto the end. For not only do those persons, who stand forth conspicuously manifest in the open sacrilege of separation, not appertain unto her: but likewise those, who, though mingled indeed corporally in her unity, are yet separated from her by a specially evil conversation. Thus, through BAPTISM, *she* HAD BROUGHT FORTH *Simon Magus: to whom, nevertheless, it was said, that he had no part in the inheritance of* CHRIST. *Were* BAPTISM *or the Gospel or the Sacraments wanting to him? Yet, because* CHARITY *was wanting, he was* BORN *in vain*.*

Visible BAPTISM *profited Simon Magus nothing, to whom invisible* SANCTICATION *was wanting†.*

Simon had BAPTISM: *but he adhered not to the bowels of the* DOVE. *Hear, why he did not adhere. Mark the very words of the Apostle Peter. There is neither part nor lot to thee in this faith: I see*

* Non omnes, quos generat (Ecclesia), ad ejus pertinent unitatem, quæ usque in finem perseverantes salvat. Neque enim hi soli ad eam non pertinent, qui separationis aperto sacrilegio manifesti sunt; sed etiam illi, qui, in ejus unitate corporaliter mixti, per vitam pessimam separantur. Etenim Simonem Magum, per baptisma, ipsa perpererat: cui tamen dictum est, quod non haberet partem in hæreditate Christi. Nunquid ei baptismus, nunquid evangelium, nunquid sacramenta, defuerunt? Sed, quia ei charitas defuit, frustra natus est. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. i. c. 10. Oper. vol. vii. p. 33.

† Nihil quippe profuit Simoni Mago visibilis baptismus, cui sanctificatio invisibilis defuit. August. Quæst. super Levit. lib. iii. quæst. 84. Oper. vol. iv. p. 88.

thee to be in the gall of bitterness. Now the DOVE *has no gall. Simon had. Therefore was he separated from the bowels of the* DOVE. *What did* BAPTISM *profit him? Glory not, then, concerning* BAPTISM: *as if, from it, there were a sufficiency of* SALVATION *to thee* *.

It may happen internally within the very Church itself, that the holy through righteousness, and the unclean through avarice, have in no wise one SPIRIT: *and yet they have alike one* BAPTISM †.

All may be BAPTISED:—*but, save by* CHARITY, *the sons of God are not distinguished from the sons of the Devil. They, who have* CHARITY, *have been* BORN *of God: and they who have not* CHARITY, *have not been* BORN *of God* ‡.

If that which is written, The Holy Spirit of Dis-

* Jam baptisma habebat (Simon): sed columbæ visceribus non hærebat. Audi, quia non hærebat. Verba ipsa Petri Apostoli adverte. Sequitur enim: *Non est tibi pars neque sors in hac fide; in felle enim amaritudinis video te esse.* Columba fel non habet. Simon habebat. Ideo separatus erat a columbæ visceribus. Baptismo illi quid proderat? Noli ergo de baptismate gloriari, quasi ex ipso salus tibi sufficiat. August. Expos. in Evan. Joan. Tractat. vi. Oper. vol. ix. p. 19.

† Fieri potest in ipsa intus Ecclesia, ut non habeant unum Spiritum, sancti per justitiam, et immundi per avaritiam: et tamen habeant unum Baptisma. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. vi. c. 12. Oper. vol. vii. p. 63.

‡ Baptizentur omnes:—non discernuntur filii Dei a filiis Diaboli, nisi charitate. Qui habent charitatem, nati sunt ex Deo: qui non habent, non sunt nati ex Deo. August. in 1 Epist. Joan. Tractat. v. Oper. vol. ix. p. 220.

cipline flees from a dissembler, will bear also upon the case, that Those, who deceitfully profess to renounce the world, are not born of the Spirit: then a person may be BAPTISED WITH WATER, *and yet not be* BORN OF THE SPIRIT*.

* Si illud quod scriptum est, *Sanctus enim Spiritus disciplinæ effugiet fictum*, etiam ad hoc valet; ut fallaciter seculo renunciantes non nascantur de Spiritu: potest quis baptizari aqua, et non nasci de Spiritu. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. vi. c. 12. Oper. vol. vii. p. 63.

CHAPTER V.

CONCLUSION FROM THE EVIDENCE WHICH RESPECTS THE IDEALITY OF REGENERATION.

We may now, in the way of conclusion from what has been adduced, fitly proceed to a winding up of the Evidence which respects the Ideality of Regeneration.

The Divines, who advocate the first of the three Systems noticed at the commencement of the present Inquiry, contend: that *The strict theological idea of Regeneration is simply* A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION; that, *Whensoever* A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION *is wrought in a man by the agency of the Blessed Spirit, such Change ought not to be distinguished by the name of Regeneration, but ought rather to bear the name of Renovation or Conversion;* and that, *While Renovation or Conversion may take place either before Baptism or in Baptism or after Baptism and may likewise be often repeated in the course of the Chris-*

tian Life, Regeneration is absolutely tied to Baptism alone as the sole appointed medium or instrument through which it is conveyed *.

On the contrary, the Divines, who advocate the third of the three Systems, contend: that *The proper theological idea of Regeneration is complexly* A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION ASSOCIATED WITH A FEDERAL CHANGE OF CONDITION; that *The Moral Change in question is indifferently called Regeneration and Renovation and Conversion;* and that, *Not being absolutely tied to the medium of Baptism, it may, either before Baptism or in Baptism or after Baptism, be conveyed through certain other means or channels as well as through the mean or channel of Baptism* †.

Finally, the Divines, who espouse the second of the three Systems, agree with those, who espouse the third, in contending: that *The proper theological idea of Regeneration is complexly* A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION ASSOCIATED WITH A FEDERAL CHANGE OF CONDITION. But they differ from them, in maintaining: that *Regeneration, as thus defined, is invariably communicated through Baptism, save in the single excepted case of Unworthy Recipiency on the part of Adults* ‡.

I. To settle this difference of opinion, it was proposed, in the first instance, that an Appeal

* See above, book i. chap. 1. § I. 1.

† See above, book i. chap. 1. § I. 3.

‡ See above, book i. chap. 1. § I. 2.

should be made to Scripture. But, since, in point of *fact*, the difference has *not* been removed by such an Appeal; because the *true sense* of Scripture is the very point, which is litigated between the contending parties: it was proposed, in the second place, that an Appeal should further be made to Primitive Antiquity; a process, which very conveniently reduces the whole matter to a *Question of Pure Historical Testimony* *.

Such a process we have now gone through: and, viewing the matter simply under this aspect, I much doubt whether the Attestation of Primitive Antiquity will establish the Ideality and the dependent nomenclature, which Divines of the first Class maintain and patronise.

The two distinct ideas of a *Federal Change of Condition* and a *Moral Change of Disposition*, which they would divide between the term *Regeneration* and the term *Renovation* or *Conversion*, confining the former idea to the former term, and restricting the latter idea to the latter term, certainly appear, according to the evidence afforded by Antiquity, to be associated together in the single comprehensive term *Regeneration:* and so far from the term *Renovation* or *Conversion* bearing a signification altogether distinct from that of the term *Regeneration*, all the three terms are indifferently employed to express that *Moral Change*

* See above, book i. chap. 2, 3, 4.

of Disposition, which, in its very notion, involves and implies a *Federal Change of Relative Condition.*

Agreeably to this estimate of the phraseology of the Ancients, we have already seen both Justin and Clement and Cyprian and Lactantius and Athanasius and Augustine and Ambrose, indiscriminately using, to express the same idea, either the several precise terms *Regeneration* and *Renovation* and *Conversion,* or what is equivalent, the several adjectives or verbs or participles which are dependent upon those terms.* And, as we advance in our inquiry, we shall still find the same

* It may be satisfactory, if I here repeat the precise words, which, as cited above, they severally employ, when professedly speaking of Moral Regeneration.

Justin Martyr. Καινοποιήθεντες.

Clement of Alexandria. Ἐπιστροφὴν.

Cyprian. *Conversio.*

Lactantius. *Mutabitur.*

Athanasius. Ἀνακαινίζεται.

Augustine. *Mutatus,*

Ambrose. *Renovat.*

Let the reader note also the following passage of Ambrose.

Renovamur enim per *lavacri regenerationem : renovamur* per *Spiritus Sancti effusionem.*—Rectè *renovatur,* qui de tenebris peccatorum in lucem virtutum *mutatur* et gratiam : ut, qui tetra prius colluire sordebat, supra nivem albenti nimis fulgore resplendeat. Ambros. de Interpell. Job et David. lib. ii. c. 9. § 35. Oper. vol. i. col. 652.

He may likewise observe this additional place of Augustine.

Si non *nascitur ex Spiritu* nisi qui veraci *conversione mutatur,* omnes, qui sæculo verbis et non factis renunciant, non utique de

terms used in a perpetual interchange, as being, in point of import, perfectly synonymous or identical. Such usage is of a quite familiar character:

Spiritu, sed ex Aqua sola nascuntur. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. vi. c. 12. Oper. vol vii. p. 63.

That, in such interchangeableness of phraseology, the early writers are borne out by Scripture, will be rendered evident by the mere arranging of a few parallel texts in juxta-position.

Except a man be *born from above*, he cannot see the kingdom of God. John iii. 3.

Except a man be *born of Water and the Spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. John iii. 5.

Except ye be *converted* and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Matt. xviii. 3.

Repent ye, therefore, and be *converted*, that your sins may be blotted out. Acts iii. 19.

According to his mercy, he saved us, by the Washing of *Regeneration* and *Renovation* of the Holy Ghost. Tit. iii. 5.

If any man be in Christ, he is a *New Creature*: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become *new*. 2 Corinth. v. 17.

In Christ Jesus, neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcison; but a *New Creation*. Galat. vi. 15.

That ye put off, concerning the former conversation, the *Old Man*, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be *renewed* in the spirit of your minds; and that ye put on the *New Man*, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. Ephes. iv. 22—24.

Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the *Old Man* with his deeds: and have put on the *New Man*, which is *renewed* in knowledge after the image of him that created him. Coloss. iii. 9, 10.

No doubt, *Renovation* is sometimes used in the inferior sense of *Restoration*; and, when it is connected with the phrase *day*

just as if the writer's unargumentatively thought, that no one, for a moment, could ever doubt its propriety.

II. It may be said, that Augustine, when speaking of the *Moral Change of Disposition* in those Adults who had received Baptism during their Infancy, styles it, not *Regeneration*, but *Conversion*. Whence, as he deems *all* Infants to be regenerated in Baptism, he thus, both clearly and consistently, makes a distinction between *Conversion* and *Regeneration*.

Such an allegation is specious: but, in truth, it is a mere fallacy.

The *only* Regeneration, which Augustine concedes to Infants *while* Infants, is that which is defined to be a *Federal Change of Condition*. Regeneration, in the sense of a *Moral Change of Disposition*, he pronounces them, on the ground of their inability to believe with the heart to righteousness and to confess with the mouth to salvation, even *incapable* of receiving.

Under such circumstances, he applies the name of *Conversion* to that necessary *Moral Change*, which Adults, *not* having received it through the medium of their *Baptism* while Infants, both may

by day as in 2 Corinth. iv. 16, it obviously means *Growth in Grace* or *Progressive Sanctification:* but Antiquity again and again testifies, that its leading or proper import is the same as that of *Regeneration* and *Conversion*.

and must, in order to their final salvation, receive *hereafter*.

But, that, by *Conversion*, he means nothing else than that *Moral Regeneration*, without which our Lord has declared it impossible for a man to enter into the kingdom of heaven, is perfectly manifest from his own sacramental description of it.

In *his* Theology, Baptism is the Mystery or Sacrament or Outward Sign of this *Conversion*. But Baptism, as we all know, is likewise the Mystery or Sacrament or outward Sign of *Regeneration*. Therefore, in the Theology of Augustine, *Conversion* and *Moral Regeneration* are identical *.

Agreeably to this double aspect of Regenera-

* Quod traditum tenet Universitas Ecclesiæ, cum parvuli infantes baptizantur, qui certè nondum possunt credere corde ad justitiam et ore confiteri ad salutem.—

In baptizatis infantibus, præcedit *Regenerationis Sacramentum:* et, si christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequitur etiam *In Corde Conversio*, CUJUS *Mysterium* præcessit in Corpore.—

Quibus rebus omnibus ostenditur: aliud esse *Sacramentum Baptismi;* aliud, *Conversionem Cordis:* sed Salutem hominis ex utroque compleri. Nec, si *unum* horum defuerit, ideo putare debemus consequens esse, ut et *alterum* desit: quia et *illud*, sine *isto*, potest esse in infante.—

Et *Baptismus* quidem potest inesse, ubi *Conversio Cordis* defuerit: *Conversio* autem *Cordis* potest quidem inesse, non percepto *Baptismo;* sed, contempto, non potest. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 23, 24, 25. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52, 53.

tion, federal and moral, Cyprian, we have seen, scruples not to speak of the Sacrament of Baptism as being a *two-fold* Sacrament; that is to say, as being a Sacrament including in its Ideality two distinct Sacraments, which might or might not be received simultaneously: *Regeneration from Water*, or a *Federal Change of Condition;* and *Regeneration from the Spirit*, or a *Moral Change of Disposition* *.

* Tunc demum planè sanctificari, et esse filii Dei, possunt, si SACRAMENTO UTROQUE nascantur, cum scriptum sit: *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex* AQUA *et* SPIRITU, *non potest introire in regnum Dei.* Cyprian. Epist. lxxii. Oper. vol. ii. p. 196.

BOOK II.

THE MEAN OR VEHICLE OF MORAL REGENERATION.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHANNEL THROUGH WHICH MORAL REGENERATION IS CONVEYED.

The Ideality of Regeneration has now, I trust, been sufficiently ascertained, both from Scripture itself, and likewise from the testimony of the early Fathers to the true sense of Scripture.

Hence, in disputation, we need no longer to be at cross purposes: ourselves annexing *one* meaning to the term, while an opponent annexes an entirely *different* meaning.

The import of the word *Regeneration* is twofold.

It denotes A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION: and it also denotes A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION.

Under the first aspect, it is *A Birth from the Spirit:* under the second aspect it is *A Birth from Water.*

Its primary idea involves and supposes its secondary idea: for it is incongruous to say, that a man has experienced a Moral Change of Disposition from evil to good, and yet that his Condition relatively to Adam and to Christ has undergone no Change. But its outward sigillation or official ratification is the ordinance of Baptism *.

This point being determined, we have next, from the same unexceptionable evidence of Scripture and Primitive Antiquity, to ascertain the Mode or Channel, through which, to fallen man, the Grace of Regeneration is conveyed.

I. There will be no difference of opinion, I suppose, touching the conveyance of Regeneration, when it is *simply* viewed as A FEDERAL CHANGE OF RELATIVE CONDITION.

This part of the double Sacrament, as Cyprian speaks, is invariably, according to circumstances, either actually conveyed, or officially sealed and ratified, through the medium or instrumentality of Baptism: so that, under *that* aspect, every baptised person, worthy or unworthy, even Simon Magus himself in the judgment of Augustine, may be said to have been regenerated; and, consequently, with whatever unworthiness or dissi-

* See Art. xxvii.

mulative unfitness, a person may have claimed and received the Sacrament of Baptism, the outward ordinance itself is not to be repeated should he hereafter be brought to experience that Conversion of Heart or that Moral Regeneration, of which, as Augustine speaks, the Mystery or Sacrament or Visible Sign had already preceded in his body *.

II. Such being the case, the sole difference of opinion, which can subsist, must respect the *conveyance* of Regeneration, when Regeneration is understood as importing A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION.

Here, accordingly, lies the discrepance, between Divines who advocate the second System as it has been specified above, and Divines who advocate the third System †.

1. Those, who advocate the second System, contend: that, *Baptism being the exclusively appointed instrument or mean or channel through which Moral Regeneration is conveyed, Moral Regeneration itself, however for a season the principle may seem to lie dormant in the baptised subject, always accompanies the administration of Outward Baptism* ‡.

* See August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. i. c. 10. lib. iv. c. 24. Oper. vol. vii. p. 33, 52. The passages have been cited at large above.

† See above, b. i. c. 1. § I. 2, 3.

‡ See Harcourt's Doctrine of the Deluge, c. xxix. vol. ii. p. 627, 628.

In other words, save in adult cases of an impenitent or hypocritical or profane reception of Baptism, they hold the *Strict* INSEPARABILITY *of Outward Baptism and Moral Regeneration.*

Broadly, therefore, we may say: that *Divines of this class hold the Doctrine of* INSEPARABILITY.

2. But those, who advocate the third System, contend: that, *Baptism not being the exclusively appointed instrument or mean or channel through which Moral Regeneration is conveyed, Moral Regeneration may thence either precede or accompany or follow the administration of Outward Baptism, according to the good will and pleasure of the Almighty Agent.*

In other words, they hold the *Possible* SEPARABILITY *of Outward Baptism* and *Moral Regeneration.*

Hence we may distinctively say: that *Divines of this class hold the Doctrine of* SEPARABILITY.

III. Since no sober person of either class, I should suppose, would presumptuously think of settling so weighty a question by the uninformed exercise of his own Insulated Private Judgment: we are, for its due settlement, obviously led, after examining Scripture itself in the first instance, to hear, in the second instance, lest we should err in our interpretation of Scripture, the attestation of the Early Ecclesiastical Writers to the sense of Scripture as received in the Primitive Church Catholic.

To this two-fold Inquiry, as holding out the only unexceptionable mode of eliciting the truth, I shall now proceed: resorting, in the first instance, to Scripture: and adverting, in the second instance, to the attestation of Ecclesiastical Antiquity.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHANNEL THROUGH WHICH MORAL REGERATION IS CONVEYED, AS IT MAY BE COLLECTED FROM SCRIPTURE.

When a difference of opinion, as to the true purport of Holy Writ, subsists between men equally devout and equally desirous of promoting the glory of God in the consistent salvation of sinners; mere insulated *disputation* will evidently be interminable: for, unless some distinct *testimony* can be produced, which shall establish the one System as Scriptural Verity, and which shall thence overthrow the other System as built only upon misconception; it is plain, that, in the abstract, *one* man's bare opinion is quite as authoritative as *another* man's bare opinion.

In an attempt, then, to produce the evidence which bears upon the topic now before us, namely THE CHANNEL THROUGH WHICH MORAL REGENERATION IS CONVEYED TO FALLEN MAN; a topic, which involves the question of THE SEPARABILITY

OR THE INSEPARABILITY OF OUTWARD BAPTISM AND INWARD MORAL REGENERATION: in an attempt, I say, to produce such evidence, the first and most natural step seems to be, that we should resort to Scripture, and learn what is said there as to the channel or medium, through which Moral Regeneration or Conversion or Renovation or (as these various cognate terms may alike be defined) A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION is communicated from above, in order to fit and qualify our sinful race for an admission into the kingdom of heaven.

From this statement, it will of course be understood, that I am at present concerned exclusively with MORAL REGENERATION OR A MORAL CHANGE OF DISPOSITION as contradistinguished from FEDERAL REGENERATION OR A FEDERAL CHANGE OF CONDITION.

I. In prosecuting the inquiry, those texts of Scripture, which bear upon it, shall first, in their due order and just classification, be nakedly and simply exhibited.

1. The following texts, then, shall constitute my first Class.

(1.) *There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. The same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him: Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him.*

Jesus answered, and said unto him: Verily, verily, I say unto thee; Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

Nicodemus saith unto him: How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?

Jesus answered: Verily, verily, I say unto thee; Except a man be born of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That, which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that, which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit. Marvel not, that I said unto thee: Ye must be born from above. The wind bloweth, where it listeth: and thou hearest the sound thereof; but canst not tell, whence it cometh, and whither it goeth. So is every one, that is born of the Spirit *.

(2.) *Such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God* †.

(3.) *Ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power. In whom also ye are circumcised with the Circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the Circumcision of Christ: buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he*

* John iii. 1—8. † 1 Corinth. vi. 11.

quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses *.

(4.) *Know ye not, that so many of us, as were baptised into Jesus Christ, were baptised into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him, by Baptism, into death: that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life* †.

(5.) *After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us, through the Washing of Regeneration and Renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that, being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life* ‡.

2. The following texts, again, shall constitute my second Class.

(1.) *He came unto his own: and his own received him not. But, as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God* §.

(2.) *Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a New Creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new* ‖.

* Coloss. ii. 10—13. † Rom. vi. 3, 4. ‡ Tit. iii. 4—7.
§ John i. 11—13. ‖ 2 Corinth. v. 17.

(3.) *In Christ Jesus, neither Circumcision availeth any thing nor Uncircumcision, but the New Creation* *.

(4.) *We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them. Wherefore remember, that ye, being in times past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that, at that time, ye were without Christ, being aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: but now, in Christ Jesus, ye, who sometimes were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ* †.

(5.) *Lie not, one to another: seeing, that ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him; where there is neither Greek nor Jew, Circumcision nor Uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond, nor free: but Christ is all, and in all* ‡.

3. The following texts shall constitute yet my third Class.

(1.) *Though ye have ten thousand instructers in Christ; yet have ye not many fathers: for, in Christ Jesus, I have begotten you through the Gospel* §.

* Galat. vi. 15.
† Ephes. ii. 10—13.
‡ Coloss. iii. 9—11.
§ 1 Corinth. iv. 15.

(2.) *I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds* *.

(3.) *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead* †.

(4.) *Seeing ye have purified your souls, in obeying the truth, through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren: see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, through the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever. For all flesh is as grass: and all the glory of man, as the flower of grass. The grass withereth: and the flower thereof fadeth away. But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the Word, which, by the Gospel, is preached unto you* ‡.

(5.) *Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness neither shadow of turning. Of his own will, begat he us by the Word of Truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures* §.

II. On these three several distinct Classes of respectively connected and respectively parallel texts, I shall now, in their order, proceed to offer a few remarks.

1. The texts of the first Class very evidently

* Philem. 10.
† 1 Peter i. 3.
‡ 1 Peter i. 22—25.
§ James i. 17, 18.

so associate Moral Regeneration with Outward Baptism, as to exhibit that Ordinance under the aspect of being a divinely appointed channel or medium, through which, by the Spirit, Moral Regeneration is communicated.

Man's Regeneration or Renovation or Spiritual Circumcision, for all these terms are indifferently employed, is effected, they collectively teach us, by the direct *agency* of the Holy Ghost. But then Water, they likewise collectively teach us, is the medium, *through* which, in the devout administration and in the faithful reception of Baptism, the Holy Ghost operates.

This, I think, is quite undeniable.

Hence, from the texts of the first Class, we distinctly ascertain: that *Baptism is, at least,* ONE *channel or medium, through which Moral Regeneration is communicated.*

Whether it be the SOLE medium or channel of such communication, is another question: and this question, I suppose, must be settled, either negatively or affirmatively, by those other two Classes of texts which still remain to be examined *.

2. Now it is impossible to read the texts of the second Class, without perceiving: that they set forth yet *another* channel or medium, through

* The pertinacity, with which the opinion of those, who deny Baptism to be the SOLE medium through which God communicates the Grace of Moral Regeneration, is mis-stated

which, no less than through Baptism, the grace of Moral Regeneration is communicated; and, consequently, that Baptism is *not* the SOLE medium or channel of such communication.

and misrepresented, may well be said to be not a little remarkable.

A recent specimen of the practice shall here be exhibited.

The anonymous Editor of *Tracts of the Anglican Fathers*, who describes himself as having composed his Preface at OXFORD on the *Feast of St. James*, writes in that Preface as follows.

In coming, and, we trust, better, times, it will, I think, be quoted as a curious and remarkable fact: that there once existed a considerable number of the English Clergy, who succeeded in persuading themselves, that THEIR CHURCH DID NOT CONSIDER THE GRACE OF REGENERATION TO BE CONVEYED IN BAPTISM. Tracts of the Anglican Fathers. part i. preface, p. iv.

That the times, both theologically and politically, are considerably out of joint; and that they contain within them great capabilities of improvement: few, I suppose, will be inclined to deny. Be this, however, as it may, the FACT, to be thus quoted by wondering posterity, would doubtless be abundantly *curious and remarkable*, if it had ever occurred: but, no where, I believe, can the phenomenon be discovered, save in the pages of a Theological Romance.

Through the course of not a very short life, I have freely conversed with Ecclesiastical Religionists of various shades: and I can say, with truth, that I never yet happened to meet with an English Clergyman, who had either *succeeded in persuading himself*, or had even *attempted* to persuade himself, *that his Church did* NOT *consider the Grace of Regeneration to be conveyed in Baptism*.

Nay, to make the matter complete, I will yet further add: that I never happened to meet with any *Publication* by an

In the first text of the present Class, a Birth, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God, is specifically mentioned. That is to say, for the words are apparently in-

English Clergyman, in which, after he had succeeded in persuading *himself,* he attempted, in the way of proselytism, to persuade *others.*

I have, indeed, met with *many* English Clergymen, and I may probably enough meet with *many more,* who have fully and perhaps not unreasonably persuaded themselves, that *their Church does* NOT *consider the Grace of Regeneration to be conveyed* EXCLUSIVELY *in Baptism:* but I was not aware, until instructed by the present Editor, that a *Denial of Baptism being the* SOLE *mean of Moral Regeneration* is identical with a *Denial of Baptism being* ANY *mean.*

The Clergymen, alluded to by the Editor, have succeeded in persuading themselves, on what they esteem sufficient evidence, that *their Church does* NOT *consider the Grace of Regeneration to be conveyed so* EXCLUSIVELY *in Baptism that it is* NEVER *conveyed through any* OTHER *channel:* and the Editor forthwith announces, *as a curious and remarkable fact,* to be quoted by perplexed posterity, that *there once existed a considerable number of the English Clergy, who succeeded in persuading themselves that their Church considered the Grace of Regeneration to be* NEVER *conveyed in Baptism.*

Of these Tracts, the first part is conspicuously headed CRANMER. Hence we naturally anticipate, that a Composition of that Prelate, favourable to the Editor's view and condemnatory of the vituperated Clergymen, is about to be presented to the reader. In such anticipation, moreover, we seem to be confirmed by the title prefixed to the first article: *Holy Baptism: a Sermon set forth by the most reverend Father in God Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop and Martyr.*

It appears, however, from the Preface, that the Sermon *thus*

capable of any other sense, the Birth, here spoken of, is Moral Regeneration.

But this Birth from the exclusive will of God

introduced is no more the property of the Prelate than of the Editor, but that it was written by Justus Jonas and only *set forth by the authority* of Cranmer. Pref. p. viii.

This circumstance of its *not* having been written by Cranmer, the Editor deems *fortunate*.

It may be so: though, in a Tract conspicuously headed CRANMER and intitled *A Sermon set forth by* CRANMER, most persons, I think, would have certainly *preferred*, as, according to the conventional requirement of language, they would naturally *expect*, a veritable Composition of CRANMER *himself*. There is nothing, however, even in this Non-Cranmerian Production, which the English Clergymen, noted by the Editor, would esteem unsound or objectionable.

Under the *sanction* of Cranmer (for so, it seems, we are to understand the expression *set forth*), Justus Jonas says: that *The Second Birth is by the Water of Baptism*. p. 3.

So speaks Jonas: and who denies it? Yet the Editor would have given a more complete account of the Doctrine sanctioned by CRANMER, had he appended Cranmer's *own* explanatory statement in Cranmer's *own* precise words.

ALL, *that be washed in the Water, be* NOT *washed with the Holy Spirit*. Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner. book iv. Works, vol. iii. p. 323. Edit. Jenkyns.

How, then, are those to be regenerated, who, according to CRANMER, were *not* washed with the Holy Spirit, when they were washed in the Water of Baptism?

Cranmer's contemporary Latimer will teach us, on the unobjectionable authority of St. John.

We be born again, by THE WORD OF THE LIVING GOD: *by the Word of God preached and opened.* THUS *cometh in our New Birth*. Latimer's Serm. vol. i. p. 72.

as avowedly contradistinguished from the will of the flesh and the will of man, or, in other words, this Moral New Birth or this Moral Regeneration, is introduced to our attention without the slightest reference or allusion to Outward Baptism as the necessary mean of its communication.

Does, then, the text supply, what might hastily be deemed a deficiency, by intimating any *other* medium, through which the Divine and Sovereign Agent may be pleased to communicate it?

Let us read and see.

As many as received Christ, to them gave he power to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.

Here, ANOTHER medium, beside that of Outward Baptism, through which Moral Regeneration may be conveyed to fallen man, is clearly pointed out: even the *Devout Reception of Christ, associated with a lively Belief or a faithful Dependence upon his name and merits.*

All the other texts, which I have arranged in this second Class, tend, so far as I can catch their meaning, the very same way.

A devout Reception of Christ, such as that of the thief on the cross; a faithful and practical Reception, as contradistinguished from a merely speculative or intellectual Reception of him: appears, in them, to be uniformly connected, as a mean, with Moral Regeneration.

Hence, from the present Class of texts, we

seem to gather: that *A Devout Reception of Christ, associated with a Lively Belief on his Name, however produced, whether by conversation or by an observance of the blessed effects of Christianity or by any other cause, is yet a* SECOND *mean through which Moral Regeneration is communicated.*

3. What has been said respecting the texts of the second Class, may equally be said respecting the texts of the third Class.

They propound, without the slightest allusion to Outward Baptism, yet a *third* channel or medium, through which, as well as through Baptism and a Devout Reception of Christ effected by any other instrumentality, the grace of Moral Regeneration is conveyed by the Holy Spirit.

This third mean is: the *Word of God*, or the *Word of Truth*, or the *Gospel*, or the *Living and Abiding Word of God which is preached to us as constituting what is called the Gospel.*

Now this *Word* or this *Gospel*, as a comparison of the parallel texts abundantly shews, and as our best commentators rightly understand the term, is the *Revealed Word of God*, first preached orally by the Apostles, through which they became the spiritual fathers of many spiritual children, and afterward by their instrumentality and superintendance committed to writing *.

Yet, through the channel or medium or subor-

* In his zeal against the Arians, Athanasius would understand the *Word of Truth*, in James i. 18, to be the *Personal*

dinate potency of this *Revealed Word of God*, men are said to be born again or to be spiritually begotten.

Word of God or *Jesus Christ himself*. See Athan. cont. Arian. Orat. iv. Oper. vol. i. p. 296.

But this exposition is rendered untenable by the context.

The Word, that is *heard* and *received with meekness* and *engrafted* and *done or performed* contradistinctively to being *heard only*, cannot be the *Personal Word*, but must be the *Revealed Word preached by the Apostles and committed to writing in the Gospel*. See James i. 18—25.

Equally impossible is it, that the *Personal Word* can be meant in 1 Peter i. 23—25.

For not only is the *Word*, there mentioned, the *Word preached:* but likewise, in ver. 25, it is unambiguously styled Ῥῆμα. Hence no argument can be drawn from the circumstance, that, in ver. 23, it is ambiguously styled Λόγος.

On the two texts, James i. 18 and 1 Peter i. 23, Dr. Whitby and Mr. Pyle and Bp. Hall theologise well and naturally.

I. Let us first hear Dr. Whitby.

1. This commentator writes, as follows, on James i. 18.

Here, in the text, *Of his own will begat he us by the Word of Truth*, is a plain evidence: that the *Word of God* is the ordinary mean of our Regeneration, it being the *Word preached*, the *Word we are to hear and to receive with meekness* (James i. 19, 21, 22.), by which the New Birth is by God wrought in us, and which, saith the Apostle, *is able to save the soul*. And it surely is a great disparagement to the Word of God, to think: that his persuasions, admonitions, exhortations, and threats, should be all insufficient to prevail with us to turn from our sinful courses and to turn to him; when all men, who do use these methods toward their children, servants, friends, or relations, do it in hopes that they shall be successful by these means. Only this is not so to be understood, as to exclude

Hence, from the third Class of texts, we additionally learn: that *The Revealed Word of God, whether faithfully preached or diligently studied, is*

the blessing and coöperation of God with the *Word preached*, or the assistance of his Holy Spirit setting it home upon our hearts: provided this be not by way of physical but of moral operation; by that Illumination of the understanding from the *Word*, which produceth that Renovation in the spirit of the mind, by which we are enabled to discern and to approve the good and acceptable and perfect will of God.

2. The same commentator similarly writes on 1 Peter i. 23.

Here, in the text, *Being born again of incorruptible seed*, is a farther evidence, that the *Word of God* is the ordinary mean of our New Birth. For it is the *Word preached*, not any inward *Word infused*, which is here styled that *Incorruptible Seed*, from which this New Birth is derived.

In the text, *Through the living Word of God*, occurs the epithet *living*. This epithet is ascribed to the *Word of God* in Heb. iv. 12: and, that this is not spoken of the *Living God*, is evident; because, in the Greek, it is not *Through the Word of the Living God*, but *Through the living Word of God*. That it is to be understood of the *Word preached*, is clear: because the epithet, *living and abiding for ever*, agrees to the same thing. Now the Apostle saith, that it is the *Word preached* that abideth for ever: and so the prophet Isaiah (chap. xl. 8.) had said before him.

II. We may next hear Mr. Pyle on 1 Peter i. 23.

You are regenerated and made the children of God by the belief of those Gospel Doctrines, the habitual practice whereof will work in you those excellent graces and divine virtues, that will for ever adorn and make you happy.

III. Lastly, we may hear Bp. Hall on James i. 18.

That infinite and unchangeable mercy of his hath approved itself to us in this: that, of his own free will, without any

a THIRD *medium or channel, through which the Holy Spirit communicates the grace of Moral Regeneration* *.

merit of ours, without any of our inclination toward him, he hath regenerated us to himself: not by the mortal and corrupt seed which we derived from Adam, but by the immortal and incorruptible seed of the *Word of Truth;* that we should be singled out as the noblest and happiest of his creatures. Paraph. on Hard Texts. Works, vol. iv. p. 468.

* Abp. Tillotson furthermore puts down the *Ministers of God*, as yet another instrumental mean of our Conversion or Moral Regeneration. See above, chap. i. § 1. 3. note.

Certainly, if we please, we may so speak in a *lowered* sense: but I deem such language a sort of theological catachresis.

The instrumentality of *God's Ministers* is of a purely secondary description: and, thence, may always be resolved into some one or other of the three proper means or channels, through which, according to Scripture, Moral Regeneration is, by the direct agency of the Holy Spirit, communicated. In fact, *God's Ministers* are not so much *themselves* a mean of Moral Regeneration, as they are rather the *dispensers* and *employers* of the appointed means.

St. Paul distinctly propounds the very idea, for which I contend.

In Christ Jesus, I have begotten you THROUGH THE GOSPEL. 1 Corinth. iv. 15. That is to say, if we paraphrase the text: *Through the application of one of the appointed means of Moral Regeneration, even the Word of Truth or the Word of God or the Preached Gospel, I may be said, as your spiritual father, to have begotten you in Christ Jesus.*

The Archbishop likewise specifies *Ourselves*, as being still another cause or mean of our Regeneration. But this is merely in the sense of our concurrency or consent or acquiescence.

CHAPTER III.

AS SCRIPTURE DETERMINES THE CHANNEL, THROUGH WHICH MORAL REGENERATION IS CONVEYED, TO BE THREE-FOLD: SO CONSISTENTLY, IT DETERMINES ALSO, THAT MORAL REGENERATION IS NOT THE INSEPARABLE CONCOMITANT OF OUTWARD BAPTISM.

SINCE the Bible, as a Communication from heaven, cannot be inconsistent with itself, the result of the preceding inquiry, as it bears upon the question of SEPARABILITY or INSEPARABILITY, may easily be anticipated.

If Scripture itself propounds THREE several subordinate means or instruments of Moral Regeneration; namely, *Outward Baptism,* and *A Believing Reception of Christ however produced,* and *The Revealed Word of God read or preached:* it seems, from such a circumstance, inevitably to follow, that Moral Regeneration cannot be so *inseparably* attached to *Outward Baptism* ALONE, as

to be the *invariable* concomitant of that particular mean EXCLUSIVELY.

And, in strict accordance with this apparently inevitable result, Scripture, in more than a single text, will be found to indicate, very unequivocally: that Outward Baptism *may* be administered as a mean of Moral Regeneration, and yet that Moral Regeneration is in no wise the *certain* and *infallible* consequence.

I. To such a purpose, for instance, we may reasonably suppose, speaks the Apostle Peter.

The long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the Ark was a preparing: wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved through water. The like figure whereunto, even Baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ *.

1. In the day of his literal resurrection, our Lord arose from the confinement of the tomb: even as Noah, in the day of his figurative resurrection, arose from the confinement of his allegorical coffin the Ark †. Hence, according to the

* 1 Peter iii. 20, 21.

† It is a remarkable circumstance, that in the old Theology of the Gentiles, the entrance of the Great Father into the Ark was deemed his burial and his descent into Hades, while his quitting it was deemed his return from Hades and his resurrection from the dead. This peculiar idea constituted the basis of the ancient Mysteries in whatever part of the world they were

Apostle, Baptism, the ANTITYPE of the purifying Waters of the Deluge, doth now also save us, through the Resurrection of Jesus Christ *.

The mystical imagery of the passage is sufficiently clear: but its practical import might be easily misunderstood. To preclude, therefore, the danger of misapprehension, St. Peter carefully intimates: that Baptism *may* be administered, *without* producing any salutary effect upon the individual recipient.

Baptism doth now also save us: observe, however, not such Baptism as is merely the putting away the filth of the flesh, but such Baptism as involves the answer of a good conscience toward God.

It is perhaps difficult to say, on what principle this distinction could have been made, if the idea of a Baptism, which was *nothing more* than the

celebrated. See my Origin of Pagan Idolatry. book ii. c. 3. book iv. c. 4. book v. c. 6. To this same idea, we find an evident allusion in the prayer of Jonah, who, from his residence in Galilee of the Gentiles, was well acquainted with the peculiarities of the old Diluvian Worship. The Ceto or large fish was a standing symbol of the Ark: and the Ark itself was esteemed a floating tomb or coffin. Hence Jonah, when really speaking out of the belly of the fish, describes himself as speaking out of the belly of Hell or Sheol or Hades or the Infernal Region of the Grave. See Jonah ii. 2, 6.

* Gr. Ἀντίτυπον. The Connection of Baptism with the Deluge has been shewn, very curiously and at considerable length, by Mr. Harcourt. See Doctrine of the Deluge, chap. x. p. 11. vol. ii. p. 474—537.

putting away the filth of the flesh, implies a theological impossibility.

Perhaps also, if Outward Baptism and Moral Regeneration be *inseparable*, it is equally difficult to say, how the Waters of the Deluge could have been made a declared type of Baptism, when yet those Waters were an agent of destruction to some *no less* certainly than they were a mean of salvation to others.

2. There is yet another matter in the present fruitful text, which throws a strong additional light upon its import.

The Apostle intimates: that, in order to Outward Baptism being spiritually or morally beneficial, there is need of *the* ANSWER *of a good conscience toward God.*

In this peculiar phraseology, there cannot be a doubt that he refers to the mode of admitting candidates to Baptism, which was wisely and piously adopted from the very beginning.

The properly prepared and duly instructed Catechumen was publicly questioned, in the face of the whole assembled Congregation, as to his faith and principles: and, if his ANSWER was satisfactory, he was forthwith admitted to Baptism. But his ANSWER, so far as *profession*, might be quite satisfactory to the Church; which thence, in belief of his sincerity and in the necessary judgment of charity, formally deemed and officially pronounced him regenerate: yet the individual

might, all the while, have given a false ANSWER in an evil conscience, being a hypocrite or a profane person or an impenitent profligate or a determined worldling. Now, of this, the Church, which is not the searcher of hearts, could be no infallible judge: but the individual himself, unless indeed labouring under some fatal delusion (for the human *heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked)*, must assuredly know the *real* quality of his ANSWER. To deter all unworthy Recipients, then, from approaching the baptismal font with a daring falsehood in their mouths, St. Peter expressly states: that no spiritual benefit would attend upon Outward Baptism, unless, on the part of the candidate, it had *the* ANSWER *of a good conscience toward God**.

* The writings of Cyprian and his correspondents are full of references to the baptismal INTERROGATION and ANSWER.

Nunquid et hoc Stephanus, et qui illi consentiunt, comprobant: maximè cui nec Symbolum Trinitatis, nec INTERROGATIO legitima et ecclesiastica defuit? Firmil. Epist. ad Cyprian. in Cyprian. Oper. Epist. lxxv. vol. ii. p. 223.

Sed et ipsa INTERROGATIO, quæ fit in baptismo, testis est veritatis. Cyprian. Epist. lxx. Oper. vol. ii. p. 190.

Quod si aliquis illud opponit, ut dicat, eandem Novatianum legem tenere quam Catholica Ecclesia teneat, eodem symbolo quo et nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, ac propter hoc usurpare eum potestatem baptizandi posse, quod videatur in INTERROGATIONE baptismi a nobis non discrepare: sciat, quisquis hoc opponendum putat; primum, non esse unam nobis et schismaticis symboli legem, neque eandem INTERROGATIONEM.

II. To the same purpose also, as we may naturally conclude from his words, speaks the Apostle Paul.

He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly: neither is that Circumcision, which is outward in the flesh. But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly: and Circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.*

1. That Circumcision under the Law was a Sacrament of the very same moral import and intent as Baptism under the Gospel; in other words, that Circumcision, like Baptism, was the Outward Sign of the Inward Grace of Regeneration: is, I think, from the constant judgment of the Early Catholic Church touching the true sense of God's Written Word, most abundantly evident†.

Who, that is even moderately learned in the Sacred Scriptures, asks Augustine, *can be ignorant, that, in a figure, the Sacrament of Circumcision preceded*

Nam, cum dicunt; *Credis remissionem peccatorum et vitam æternam per Sanctam Ecclesiam?* mentiuntur in INTERROGATIONE, quando non habeant Ecclesiam. Cyprian. Epist. lxix. Oper. vol. ii. p. 183.

* Rom. ii. 28, 29. Compare Coloss. ii. 10—13.

† Such also is the well supported judgment of the Anglican Church.

Circumcision was a Sacrament: which preached, unto the outward senses, the Inward Cutting away of the Foreskin of the Heart; and which sealed and made sure, in the hearts of the circumcised, the promise of God touching the promised Seed

the Sacrament of Baptism; inasmuch as the Apostle hath most openly said, concerning Christ: Ye are

that they looked for. Homil. of Common Prayer and Sacram. Homil. book ii. p. 297.

On the same principle, she has framed her Collect for the Circumcision of Christ.

Grant us the true Circumcision of the Spirit: that, our hearts and all our members being mortified from all worldly and carnal lusts, we may in all things obey thy blessed will.

In truth, it is difficult to conceive what *other* sense can be annexed to the language of St. Paul in the passage now before us. He, that is a son of Abraham inwardly, has the Circumcision of the heart: he, that is only a son of Abraham outwardly, has nothing more than the Circumcision in the flesh. Unless Moral Regeneration were the Inward Grace of Outward Circumcision, the words of the Apostle seem to convey no intelligible meaning.

I confess myself to have insisted the more largely upon this point, because some speculative and paradoxical Moderns have actually, so far as I can understand them, denied the notional identity of the Levitical Sacrament of Circumcision and the Christian Sacrament of Baptism. The ground of that identity lies far deeper than the Outward Sign or the Conventional Nomenclature. Moral Regeneration is rendered necessary by the Apostasy of the Fall. Hence, in order to an entrance into the kingdom of heaven, it has ever been *alike* necessary, both under the Patriarchal Dispensation, and the Levitical Dispensation, and the Christian Dispensation. The Gospel, though it might propound the Doctrine with greater clearness, typical Circumcision partaking of the character of all types, did not *make* Regeneration necessary to fallen man, but *found* it so. Its necessity is a necessity of *inherency*, not a necessity of *arbitrariness*. The necessity exists in the very nature of the subject: and the subject is the whole Human Race collectively.

complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power: in whom also ye are circumcised with the Circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead: and you being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses? Of this Circumcision, then not made by hand, which is now in Christ, that Circumcision made by hand, which was given unto Abraham, is the preördained similitude *.

Immediately before he put such a question, Augustine had written, as follows.

For no other reason must we believe, that the Circumcision of Children on the eighth day was

* Quod sacramentum Circumcisionis in figura præcessisse Baptismatis, quis, vel mediocriter Sacris Literis eruditus, ignoret; cum apertissimè de Christo dicat Apostolus: *Qui est caput omnis principatus et potestatis; in quo etiam circumcisi estis Circumcisione non manu facta, in expoliatione corporis carnis, in Circumcisione Christi: consepulti eo in Baptismo, in quo et consurrexistis per fidem operationis Dei, qui suscitavit illum a mortuis: et vos cum essetis mortui in delictis et præputio carnis vestræ, vivificavit cum illo, donans nobis omnia delicta?* Hujus ergo Circumcisionis non manu factæ, quæ nunc fit in Christo, similitudo præmissa est illa Circumcisio manu facta, quæ data est Abrahæ. August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. vi. c. 7. Oper. vol. vii. p. 387.

divinely enjoined to the ancient fathers, except to signify the Regeneration that is in Christ: who, after the sabbatical seventh day, during which he lay in the grave delivered up on account of our offences, on the following day, that is, the eighth, rose again on account of our Justification.*

So familiar, indeed, is the idea to the mind of Augustine, that he, again and again, in different parts of his Works, will be found to recur to it†.

* Nec ob aliud credendum est, antiquis patribus hoc divinitus fuisse præceptum, ut octavo die circumciderent parvulos, ad significandam Regenerationem quæ fit in Christo: qui, post diem septimum sabbati, quo die jacuit in sepulchro traditus propter delicta nostra, sequenti, id est, octavo die in hebdomatibus, resurrexit propter Justificationem nostram. August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. vi. c. 7. Oper. vol. vii. p. 387.

† Hoc in illo significabatur expiari Circumcisione octavi diei, hoc est, sacramento Mediatoris in carne venturi: quia, per eandem fidem venturi in carne Christi et morituri pro nobis et tertio die (qui post septimum sabbati fuerat futurus octavus) resurrecturi, etiam justi salvabantur antiqui. *Traditus est*, enim, *propter delicta nostra: et resurrexit propter Justificationem nostram.* Ex quo instituta est Circumcisio in populo Dei, quod erat tunc signaculum justitiæ fidei, ad significationem purgationis valebat, et parvulis, originalis veterisque peccati: sicut et Baptismus ex illo valere cœpit ad innovationem hominis, ex quo est institutus. August. de Nupt. et Concupis. lib. ii. c. 11. Oper. vol. vii. p. 318.

Cernis, quemadmodum Circumcisionem Circumcisioni, comminationem comminationi, vir ecclesiastica doctrina præditus (scil. Cyprianus) comparavit. Quod, ergo, est *octavo die non circumcidi;* hoc est, *in Christo non baptizari.* Et, quod est *perire de populo suo;* hoc est, *non intrare in regnum cœlorum.*

Nor does he, in any wise, stand single in his attestation to this universal primitive exposition of the Levitical Sacrament of Circumcision.

Our circumcision, I am speaking of the grace of

Et tamen vos (scil. Pelagiani), in Baptismate parvulorum, expoliationem carnis, hoc est, Circumcisionem non manu factam, celebrari negatis, cum nihil eos, quo expoliari debeant, habere contenditis. August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. ii. c. 6. Oper. vol. vii. p. 339.

His certis illa incerta de octavo die quæstio dissoluta est, atque in Concilio judicatum, homini nato, ne in æternum pereat, omni die licere succurrere: cum etiam, de ipsa carnali Circumcisione ratio redderetur, quod umbra esset futuri: non quod intelligeremus etiam Baptismum octavo, ex quo natus est homo, die, dari oportere, sed nos in Christi resurrectione spiritaliter circumcidi; qui, tertio quidem post diem passionis, in diebus tamen hebdomadarum, quibus tempora provolvuntur, octavo, hoc est, post sabbatum primo die a mortuis resurrexit. August. de Peccat. Merit. et Remiss. lib. iii. c. 5. Oper. vol. vii. p. 275.

Cordis Circumcisione gaudentes, non eam in carne adumbratam figuratamque deriderent tempore Veteris Testamenti.—Quapropter, O immundissima vanitas, itane displicet tibi, in membro humano, unde humana generatio propagatur, signum Regenerationis humanæ, illum, cui munda sunt omnia, Deum jussisse constitui. August. cont. Faust. Manich. lib. vi. c. 2. Oper. vol. vi. p, 86.

The principles of the Manichèans led them to deny, that Circumcision either was or could be the type and precursor of Baptism and Regeneration. But, in this denial, we see, they ran counter to the interpretative judgment of the entire Church Catholic: which, in point of idealism and sacramental import, always, *mutatis mutandis*, reckoned Circumcision under the Law and Baptism under the Gospel to be identical.

Baptism, says Chrysostom in the East, echoing his contemporary Augustine in the West, *affords a cure free from pain, and is to us the administration of ten thousand blessings, and fills us with the grace of the Holy Spirit. Nor, as was the case with Circumcision under the Law, has it any set time: but, in infancy and in middle age and in old age, any one is alike permitted to receive the circumcision not made with hands* *.

So again, we find Athanasius, in Africa, still maintaining and inculcating the very same opinion.

Circumcision sets forth nothing else, than the Putting off of the Natural Birth: for we put off him who on the sixth day died as to the flesh; and we are renewed on the Lord's day, when the old man, being unclothed, was born again by the Resurrection. This is it, which Paul speaketh to the Colossians. In whom ye are circumcised with the Circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the Circumcision of Christ: buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him. Circumcision, therefore, was the type of the Putting off Sin through Baptism:—for Abraham, having believed, received

* Ἡ δὲ ἡμετέρα περιτόμη, ἡ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, λέγω, χάρις, ἀνώδυνον ἔχει τὴν ἰατρείαν, καὶ μυρίων ἀγαθῶν πρόξενος γίνεται ἡμῖν, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἡμᾶς ἐμπίμπλησι χάριτος. Καὶ οὐδὲ ὡρισμένον ἔχει καιρὸν, καθάπερ ἐκεῖ· ἀλλ' ἐξέστι, καὶ ἐν ἀώρῳ ἡλικίᾳ, καὶ ἐν μέσῃ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ γήρᾳ, γενόμενον τίνα, ταύτην δέξασθαι τὴν ἀχειροποίητον περιτομήν. Chrysost. in Gen. Homil. xl.

Circumcision, which was the Sign of Regeneration through Baptism *.

Furthermore, at a yet earlier period, this ruled case of exposition, which, in point of ideality, identified Circumcision and Baptism, led some not unnaturally to fancy: that, since Circumcision under the law was virtually the same as Baptism under the Gospel, and since Children, under the Law, were not to be circumcised until the eighth day: therefore, analogously, under the Gospel, Children ought not to be baptised until the eighth day. This notion, Cyprian, with all his Clergy, very justly condemned, as an unwarrantable and mischievous refinement. But, as it is quite clear that no such *notion* could ever have been taken up, save under the influence of an universal *belief* that Circumcision under the Law corresponded with Baptism under the Gospel: so we may observe, that Cyprian and his Clergy, while they condemn the *notion*, leave the *belief* itself uncontroverted and uncensured.

† Ἡ γὰρ περιτομὴ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐδήλου, ἢ τὴν τῆς γενέσεως ἀπέκδυσιν. Τὸν γὰρ τῇ ἕκτῃ ἀποθανόντα ἀπεκδεδυσκόμεθα· καὶ ἀνακαινούμεθα τῇ κυριακῇ, ὅτε ὁ παλαιὸς ἀπεκδυθεὶς ἀνεγεννήθη τῇ ἀναστάσει. Τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἔφη ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κολοσσεῖς· Ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθη τῇ περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκὸς, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι εἰς τὴν ᾅδην, ἐν ᾧ καὶ συνηγέρθητε. Τῆς γὰρ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀπεκδύσεως τύπος ἦν ἡ περιτομὴ.—Πιστεύσας γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἔλαβε τὴν περιτομὴν σημεῖον οὖσαν τῆς διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀναγεννήσεως. Athan. de Sabbat. et Circum. Oper. vol. i. p. 763.

So far as respects the matter of Infants, concerning whom you have said; that Those, who are only two or three days old, ought not to be baptised; and that The Law of ancient Circumcision ought to be considered, in agreement with which, a child, in your opinion, ought not to be baptised and sanctified before he had attained the eighth day: a far different judgment was given by all in our Council. No one consented to what you thought fitting to be done: but, on the contrary, we all judged, that the mercy and grace of God ought not to be denied to any person born of man.—For, as to the observation of the eighth day in the Circumcision of the flesh according to the Jewish Law, that Ordinance is a Sacrament, appointed beforehand in shadow and in image, but completed in truth at the coming of Christ. The eighth day, that is, the first day after the sabbath, was about to be that, on which the Lord would rise again, and would confer upon us true life, and would give unto us the Spiritual Circumcision. Therefore, this eighth day, the first and the Lord's day after the sabbath, went before in an image: which image ceased, when the truth afterward supervened, and when Spiritual Circumcision was given unto us *.

* Quantum vero ad causam infantium pertinet, quos dixisti intra secundum vel tertium diem, quo nati sint, constitutos, baptizari non oportere, et considerandam esse legem Circumcisionis antiquæ, ut intra octavum diem eum qui natus est baptizandum et sanctificandum non putares; longe aliud, in con-

I might easily cite a variety of other testimonies to the same effect: but that of the very ancient writer Justin Martyr, who became a convert to Christianity only about thirty years after the death of St. John, will be amply sufficient to evince the pertinence of the question put by Augustine.

The Commandment of Circumcision, which enjoins that Infants should always be circumcised on the eighth day, was a type of the True Circumcision, with which we were circumcised from error and wickedness through Jesus Christ our Lord, who rose again from the dead on the first day of the week. For the first day of the week, remaining the first of all days, agreeably to the entire number of the days viewed as revolving in the hebdomadal cycle, is called the eighth, though it still remains the first *.

cilio nostro, omnibus visum est. In hoc enim, quod tu putabas esse faciendum, nemo consensit: sed universi potius judicavimus, nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei et gratiam denegandam.—Nam, quod in Judaica Circumcisione carnali octavus dies observabatur, sacramentum est in umbra atque in imagine antepræmissum, sed veniente Christo, veritate completum. Nam, quia octavus dies, id est, post sabbatum primus dies, futurus erat, quo Dominus resurgeret, et nos vivificaret, et Circumcisionem nobis spiritalem daret: hic dies octavus, id est, post sabbatum primus et dominicus, præcessit in imagine; quæ imago cessavit, superveniente postmodum veritate, et data nobis spiritali Circumcisione. Cyprian. Epist. lxiv. Oper. vol. ii. p. 160, 161.

* Ἡ δὲ ἀνάληψις τῆς περιτομῆς, κελεύουσα τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ παντὸς

The perfect sameness of all these interpretations, so far as principle is concerned, fully shews, that one only mode of exposition was adopted, throughout the Catholic Church, from the beginning. Whence we may be morally certain, that that mode of exposition sets forth the true apostolic sense of Holy Scripture. The point is decided, not by the vague licence of Insulated Private Judgment, but by the intelligible law of Historical Testimony.

2. Thus we see, then, that the typical character of Circumcision relatively to Baptism, and consequently the notional or sacramental identity of Circumcision under the Law and of Baptism under the Gospel, was, from the first, a ruled case of interpretation. Therefore, with this authoritative exposition in our hands, we may now proceed to examine the important text before us.

In the Levitical Sacrament of Circumcision, it is certain, that the Inward Grace was by no means inseparable from the Outward Sign. An individual might be circumcised in his flesh, and *that* too even in his Infancy, without receiving,

περιτέμνειν τὰ γεννώμενα, τύπος ἦν τῆς ἀληθινῆς περιτομῆς, ἣν περιετμήθημεν ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης καὶ πονηρίας διὰ τοῦ ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντος τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέρᾳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. Μία γὰρ τῶν σαββάτων, πρώτη μένουσα τῶν πασῶν ἡμερῶν, κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν πάλιν τῶν πασῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς κυκλοφορίας, ὀγδόη καλεῖται, καὶ πρώτη οὖσα μένει. Justin. Mart. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 201, 202.

through such medium, any Moral Change of Disposition. To establish this position, nothing more is requisite than a bare citation of texts.

If their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquities: then will I remember my covenant with Jacob *.

Circumcise, therefore, the foreskin of your heart: and be no more stiff-necked †.

The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live ‡.

Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your heart, ye men of Jacob and inhabitants of Jerusalem: lest my fury come forth like fire; and burn, that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings §.

To whom shall I speak and give warning, that they may hear? Behold, their ear is uncircumcised, and they cannot hearken: behold, the word of the Lord is unto them a reproach; they have no delight in it ‖.

Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will punish all them which are circumcised with the uncircumcised: Egypt, and Judah, and Edom, and the children of Ammon, and Moab, and all that are in the utmost corners that dwell in the wilderness.

* Levit. xxvi. 41, 42. † Deuter. x. 16.
‡ Deuter. xxx. 6. § Jerem. iv. 4.
‖ Jerem. vi. 10.

For all these nations are uncircumcised: and all the House of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart *.

Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye †.

These texts distinctly set forth the sacramental character of Circumcision. It was an Outward Sign, representing an Inward Grace which it was *designed* instrumentally and mediately to convey. This Inward Grace was a Moral Change of Disposition: for it is described as *a Circumcision of the heart;* and its characteristic is a *Love of the Lord God with all the heart and all the soul.* Hence the Inward Grace of Circumcision was the very same, as the Inward Grace of Baptism. In a word, it was Moral Regeneration.

But, from the texts before us, it is quite obvious; that persons *might* partake of the Sacrament of Outward Circumcision, *without* receiving in concomitancy the Inward Moral Circumcision of the Heart: for, though regularly circumcised outwardly, they *might* still remain stiff-necked, and evil in their doings, and viewing the word of the Lord as a reproach, and having no delight in that word, and always resisting the gracious operations of the Holy Ghost. Now these are indisputably marks or tokens of the natural man, as contradistinguished from man when regenerated.

* Jerem. ix. 25, 26. † Acts vii. 51.

Therefore in the Sacrament of Circumcision, the Sign and the Thing Signified were not inseparable.

It is, however, as we have fully seen, an ecclesiastically ruled case: that, *What Circumcision was under the Law, Baptism is under the Gospel.*

Hence, by a logical necessity, it seems to follow: that *Outward Baptism and Inward Moral Regeneration are not inseparable.*

Nor does this conclusion follow only, in the matter of Adults. Circumcision was administered, not to Adults alone, but likewise, and far more extensively, to Infants. Now those, who had been circumcised in their Infancy, are, nevertheless, addressed, as, *still* being stiff-necked, as *still* being uncircumcised in heart and in ears, as *still* having no delight in God's word, as *still* perpetually resisting the Holy Ghost.

Therefore, since, by the universal interpretation of the Early Church, Baptism and Circumcision are ruled to be spiritually or sacramentally identical, I perceive not myself, by what logical machinery we can escape the result: that, *Even in the matter of Infants, Outward Baptism and Inward Moral Regeneration are not inseparable.*

Accordingly, in the text from St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans now specially under discussion, the *whole*, I take it, of this precise conclusion, is effectively propounded.

For, if, in point of ideality, Circumcision and Baptism be the same: then, with the requisite

verbal adaptation to the Christian Sacrament, the text will run in manner following.

He is not a Christian, which is one outwardly: neither is that Baptism, which is outward in the flesh. But he is a Christian, which is one inwardly: and Baptism is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God.*

III. Exactly the same result will be brought out by various declarations of the Apostle John: for, in truth, those declarations act as a sort of commentary upon the language of the Apostle Paul, which we have last considered.

Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for God's seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the Chil-

* Since females are incapable of Circumcision, their case was specially provided for under the Law: and they were dedicated to God and admitted into covenant with him, through the medium of purification and sacrifice. See Levit. xii. 5—8.

Among the Jews, the principle was reasonably understood to be: that, in the summing up of God's people, the females, as help-meets, were to be viewed as subincluded with the males.

Foemellæ non circumciduntur, sed sufficit Circumcisio masculorum: quia illæ sunt adjutoria virorum; et illorum dominio, gubernationi, et imperio, subditæ. Buxtorf. Synagog. Judaic. c. iv. . 114.

Accordingly, the Early Christian Church never deemed this circumstance to afford any reason, why Circumcision under the Law should not be sacramentally identified with Baptism under the Gospel.

dren of God are manifest, and the Children of the Devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness, is not of God *.

Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one, that loveth, is born of God, and knoweth God. He, that loveth not, knoweth not God: for God is love †.

Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God: and every one, that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him. By this we know that we love the Children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments. For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous. For, whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world; even our faith ‡.

We know, that, whosoever is born of God, sinneth not: but he that is begotten of God, keepeth himself; and that wicked one toucheth him not §.

In none of these texts, I admit, does St. John *specifically mention* Baptism: but, as he is addressing a Community of Baptised Christians, so, I think, there cannot be a reasonable doubt, that he is speaking of individuals among them, who, whether good or bad, have all alike been *actually* baptised ‖.

* 1 John iii. 9, 10. † 1 John iv. 7, 8.

‡ 1 John v. 1—4. § 1 John v. 18.

‖ The point, that *All the individuals, spoken of by St. John*

This matter is important, because it bears directly upon the point now under consideration. Let us note, then, its immediate and necessary tendency.

St. John, like St. Paul, makes certain qualities of the heart, expanding into certain outward lines of conduct, the sure characteristics of Moral Regeneration: while, at the same time, he tells us, that the Children of God or those who have been born of God, and the Children of the Devil or those who have *not* been born of God, are alike *manifest*, or may alike be *openly known*, by the infallible criterion of their doing righteousness or their *not* doing righteousness.

Now, in thus making the *presence* of certain qualities of the heart expanding into certain outward lines of conduct the sure mark or badge of Moral Regeneracy, the Apostle, by the rule of Converseness, inevitably makes the *absence* of those practical qualities the mark or badge of Moral Unregeneracy.

Thus, accordingly, runs the comment of Augustine upon the texts in question.

The Children of God are not distinguished from

in the cited texts, had been baptised, is, strenuously, and, according to my own apprehension, most justly, maintained by Bishop Bethell: but, so far as I can understand the merits of the case, the establishment of that point is fatal to the theory of an *Invariable Concomitance of Regeneration upon Baptism*. See General View of the Doctr. of Regen. chap. v. p. 63—76.

the Children of the Devil, save by Charity. They who have Charity, have been born of God: and they, who have it not, have not been born of God.*

Yet all the individuals, whether good or bad, spoken of by the Apostle, had plainly, and indeed confessedly, been baptised.

Hence it will follow: that St. John, as his language was understood and interpreted by the Early Church, teaches the very possible SEPARABILITY of Outward Baptism and Inward Regeneration. According to the beloved Apostle, a man may have been duly baptised into a Christian Community: but still, if he bears not the marks or badges of Moral Regeneracy, he has not, through Baptism, been born of God; neither is he to be deemed, by virtue of his Baptism alone, a regenerated Child of God.

All, that St. John says in the various texts which have been cited, is but an expanded comment upon the brief decision of St. Paul.

* Non discernuntur filii Dei a filiis Diaboli, nisi charitate. Qui habent charitatem, nati sunt ex Deo: qui non habent, non nati sunt ex Deo. August. in 1 Epist. Joan. Tractat. v. Oper. vol. ix. p. 220.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DISPLAY OF GOD'S MERCY IN THE COMMUNICATING OF MORAL REGENERATION TO FALLEN MAN BY THREE SEVERAL CHANNELS.

In the scriptural appointment of three several means or channels, by which instrumentally the Blessed Spirit is pleased to communicate to fallen man the grace of Moral Regeneration, we cannot but be struck with the mercy attendant upon this cheering dispensation of our benificent Redeemer.

I. The truth of such remark will be strongly apparent, if we attend to the contrasted mercilessness of some Schemes of Technical Theology.

It is an adjudged point: that *None, save worthy Recipients, are morally regenerated in Baptism.*

But, from the very beginning, it has always been another adjudged point: that *A Beneficial*

Repetition of Baptism is a Theological Impossibility *.

And, furthermore, according to the distinct statement of our Lord himself, it is yet a third adjudged point: that, *Except a man be born from above, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God* †.

Now, from the adjudication of these three several points, the result is alike clear and inevitable.

If Baptism be the *sole* appointed mean, through which Moral Regeneration is ever communicated: then no man, who has been an unworthy Recipient of Outward Baptism, can ever *hereafter* be morally regenerated.

And, if he be thus rendered for ever incapable of *Moral Regeneration:* then, by a necessary

* Duo baptismata esse non possunt. Cyprian. Epist. lxxi. Oper. vol. ii. p. 193.

Cum ergo sint duce nativitatis, ille (scil. Nicodemus) unam intelligebat. Una est de terra: alia, de cœlo. August. Expos. in Evan. Joan. Tractat. xi. Oper. vol. ix. p. 34.

Εἷς Κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα. Ὥσπερ δὲ ἓν βάπτισμα, οὕτως καὶ μία πίστις. Athan. Epist. ad Serap. Oper. vol. ii. p. 22.

Δεικνύον, ἓν εἶναι τὸ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας βάπτισμα, καὶ μὴ δεύτερον. Ἑβραίοις γὰρ ἔγραφε· καὶ, ἵνα μὴ νομίσωσι κατὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ συνήθειαν, προφάσει μετανοίας, εἶναι πολλὰ καθ' ἡμέραν βαπτίσματα· διὰ τοῦτο, μετανοεῖν μὲν παραινεῖ, μίαν δὲ εἶναι τὴν ἀνακαίνισιν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, καὶ μὴ δευτέραν, ἀποφαίνεται· ὡς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ φησὶ· Μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα. Athan. in illud Evan. Quicunque dixerit. Oper. vol. i. p. 767.

† John iii. 3—8.

consequence, he is also rendered for ever incapable of *Future Salvation* in heaven.

Hence those good men, but, I should think, very unhappy Christians, who restrict the communicating of Moral Regeneration to the channel of Outward Baptism *exclusively;* while, at the same time, they are compelled, with the Catholic Church in all ages, to admit, that a hypocrite or an infidel or an impenitent sinner may, in the reception of Baptism, place an effectual impediment in the way of his deriving any spiritual benefit from it: those good men, I say, who thus theologise, plainly shut out all persons so circumstanced from the economical possibility of any future Moral Regeneration, and thence eventually shut them out also from every possibility of attaining to Eternal Salvation *.

* The fearful result, which I have here stated, has been felt to be the legitimate and logical conclusion from the Doctrine, that *Baptism is the* SOLE *channel through which Moral Regeneration is ever communicated:* for the Theory of a *Suspension of Regenerative Grace when Baptism is received unworthily* has evidently been invented to parry it. See above, book i. chap. i. § I. 2. note.

I confess myself unable to discern the satisfactory adjustment of such a Theory.

The very term *Suspension* of necessity imports *Non-Communication:* for a Favour *suspended* is, at the time of its Suspension, *not communicated;* and a Favour *communicated* is, at the time of its Communication, *not suspended.*

If, by reason of unworthy or profane Recipiency of Baptism, the Conferring of Moral Regeneration be *suspended;* and if the

II. In such a joyless Scheme of Theology, the very reverse of what is characterised as *Good*

actual Conferring of Moral Regeneration be thus made altogether *contingent* upon future circumstances, as to whether Moral Regeneration shall *ever* be conferred or *never* be conferred: then, most indisputably, I should think, Moral Regeneration itself, at the time of its Suspension, which, by the very hypothesis, coincides with the time of an Unworthy Recipiency of Baptism, was NOT *actually* conferred.

Nothing, in truth, can be more plain, at least to my own apprehension, than that the idea of an *Actual Conferring* is utterly incompatible with the idea of a *Contingent Suspension*.

The man either *was*, or *was not*, morally regenerated at Baptism.

If he *was*: then no Suspension took place.

If a Suspension took place: then he *was not*.

It would be in vain to say: that Baptism always operates *efficaciously*, though not always *immediately*.

Such an allegation, were it ever adventured, being professedly built upon an *invariably* efficacious operation, requires the admission: that, *At some time or other, Baptism, though received unworthily, would* NEVER *fail of operating efficaciously*. In other words, such an allegation requires the admission: that *Every unworthily baptised person would, at some future time or other,* INVARIABLY *become morally regenerate*.

Now an allegation, thus circumstanced, even to say nothing of the necessity of supporting it by well ascertained constancy of FACT, destroys at once the whole Scheme of *Conditional Contingency*, upon which the Theory of *Suspension* is avowedly built: and thus inevitably makes the operation of Baptism to be, not moral, but mechanical. This, however, under the name of the *Opus Operatum*, is the precise unscriptural absurdity imposed by the Tridentine Doctors.

Si quis dixerit, per ipsa Novæ Legis Sacramenta, ex Opere

Tidings of Great Joy, the very reverse of what is expressed even in the term *Evangele*, such a result, so far as I can perceive, is absolutely unavoidable.

But, unless I greatly mistake, not thus gloomily theologises the divine revelation of our God and Saviour. A hope is still held out, to those miserable dissemblers, to those wretched sinners against their own souls, to those awful dealers in sacramental profanation. They have missed, indeed, the attainment of Moral Regeneration through the mean of Outward Baptism: but still the door of mercy is not closed against them. Two other effectual means yet remain. Let them, hereafter (by whatever instrument, oral or written, the blessed impression may be conveyed), devoutly receive the Lord Jesus, believing in his name; or let the Word of God, whether read or preached in the Gospel, become unto them the incorruptible seed of eternal life: in either case, and through either mean, the remembrance of their past daring impiety may be blotted out, and they may yet attain to the high privilege of Moral Regeneration.

III. Is the matter still doubted? Is it yet

Operato, non conferri gratiam, sed solam Fidem Divinæ Promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere: anathema sit. Concil. Trident. sess. vii. can. 8. p. 85.

The very contrary is asserted by the Church of England. See Art. xxv.

thought, that, through one *sole* mean, the mean of Outward Baptism, Moral Regeneration is economically communicated? Let us, then, yet further test the System *now* by Holy Scripture, as we will *hereafter*, God helping us, test it by the recorded judgment of the witnessing Church Catholic.

1. Respecting the point, *How far sin is pardonable and how far it is unpardonable*, we have the express decision of our Lord himself.

I say unto you: ALL *manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men*.*

(1.) *One* sin alone, then, is unpardonable: ALL *other* sins, of course with repentance and through faith in the boundless merits of Christ's most precious bloodshedding, both may and shall be forgiven.

Now, if the Unworthy Reception of Baptism, by shutting a man out from obtaining through *that* mean the grace of Moral Regeneration, shuts him out also from *ever* obtaining it through any *other* mean: *then* it precludes him also from *ever* entering into the kingdom of heaven.

But, if it precludes him from ever entering into the kingdom of heaven: *then* it must so preclude him, because it is unpardonable.

* Matt. xii. 31.

And thus, finally, if it so preclude him because it is unpardonable: *then* it must be the sin against the Holy Ghost; because blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is defined to be the ONLY unpardonable offence.

(2.) Hence, I apprehend, those, who maintain that Baptism is the SOLE mean through which Moral Regeneration is communicated, stand pledged to demonstrate: that the Unworthy Reception of Baptism is the Sin or Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost *.

But, if such demonstration cannot be effected: *then* the Unworthy Reception of Baptism may, upon Repentance, be pardoned. And, if the Unworthy Reception of Baptism may thus be pardoned: *then*, plainly, must it be also remedied by a communication of the Grace which was missed at Baptism; for, *without* such communication of that Regenerative Grace which (as our Lord assures us) is essentially necessary toward the attainment of everlasting life, pardon were a mere unmeaning mockery.

2. To put, however, the general question out of all reasonable dispute, nothing more seems

* Origen and Theognostus *approximated* to this notion, though they did not *precisely adopt* it. In *their* dreadful estimate, sin committed after Baptism was the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost. They are very well confuted by the great Athanasius. See Athan. in illud Evan. Quicunque dixerit. Oper. vol. i. p. 765—767.

now to be wanting, than an actual case, recorded in Scripture itself, of the communication of Moral Regeneration through *another* mean than that of Outward Baptism.

(1.) Now precisely such a case will readily occur, even to the most careless reader of Holy Writ.

The penitent thief who expired on the cross, had never previously been a disciple, and had never previously been baptised. For a season so hardened was he in guilt, that he even joined his abandoned fellow in reëchoing the ribald blasphemy of the mob and the priesthood*. Yet, of this utterly unpromising subject, it pleased our gracious Lord, to touch the heart and the conscience, in the very article of death. Retracting the profaneness of his former mockery, he suddenly rebuked his profligate associate. *Dost thou not fear God, seeing that thou art in the same condemnation? And we, indeed, justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss.* Then, turning the eye of faith to the now acknowledged Redeemer, *Lord*, said he, *remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom.* The prompt answer was: *Verily I say unto thee; To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise*†.

* Matt. xxvii. 39—44. Mark xv. 29—32.

† Luke xxiii. 39—43.

(2.) Such is the recorded case of the penitent thief: and the drift of the reasoning, which inevitably flows from it, is abundantly manifest.

Without the Moral Regeneration of the Holy Spirit, no man can enter into the kingdom of heaven. Thus plainly theologised our Lord to Nicodemus.

To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise. Thus, no less plainly, spake the same Lord to the penitent thief.

According, then, to this two-fold statement of Christ, the penitent thief must have been morally regenerated of the Holy Spirit, or he could not have entered with him into Paradise preparatory to his final admission into heaven.

But this same penitent thief was never baptised.

Therefore, Moral Regeneration must have been communicated to him, *without* Baptism: and, consequently, it must have been communicated to him through some other mean *than* Baptism.

What, then, *was* the mean?

Baptism it clearly was *not*: for the man had never *been* baptised.

The Word of God preached or read in the Gospel it was *not:* for Christ spake not to the man, until the man had first spoken to him; and the man himself had never been a disciple or a follower of the Lord, as is evident from the circumstance of his blasphemous profaneness even

down to the very turning point of his Moral Regeneration or Spiritual Conversion.

Nothing remains, save yet a third prescribed mean: and that third mean, if I mistake not, is distinctly propounded to us in the Gospel. Even at the twelfth hour, if I may so speak, the penitent, apparently struck by the ineffable majesty and forgiving love of the victim even in the midst of his sufferings, *devoutly received the Saviour*, who came unto him in the divine power of the Spirit: and thence, with the hope of pardon and glory, he *believed on his name**. This *Devout and Faithful Reception of Christ*, through the mighty working of the Holy Ghost, was the mean of his Moral Regeneration. To him gave the Saviour power to become a son of God. And thus was he born, as St. John speaks, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God: born, we may well say, regally, instantaneously, abidingly, effectually †.

* See Luke xxiii. 27—31, 34.

† John i. 12, 13.

CHAPTER V.

A REASONABLE ANTICIPATION OF THE GENERAL TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

From this discussion, it is easy to anticipate, what the general testimony of the Early Church, respecting Outward Baptism and Inward Moral Regeneration, would most probably be, even before we descend to the process of an actual examination.

I. Scripture marks out three several means, through which the grace of Moral Regeneration is communicated by the Holy Spirit: namely *Outward Baptism;* and *The Believing Reception of Christ;* and *The Revealed Word of God.*

Now, whenever Moral Regeneration is communicated, either through the mean of *A Believing Reception of Christ,* or through the mean of *The Revealed word of God:* it is obvious, that nothing occurs, which can strike so *sensibly* upon the Church, as to warrant her in positively determining, that this man or that man, at this hour or that

hour, by this operation upon the mind or that operation upon the mind, was morally regenerated. But the mean of *Outward Baptism*, which Scripture defines to be one of the three means of communicating Moral Regeneration, and which thence is denominated *The Laver of Regeneration*, is perfectly *sensible* and (as it were) altogether *tangible*, so that of *it* the Church can specifically take cognizance.

Such being the case, since *Outward Baptism* is indisputably specified as *one* of the three means, and since nothing save the event can prove that it has failed in beneficial operation: we assuredly, at the time when the Sacrament is administered, have no right to pronounce, that the newly baptised individual has *not* been morally regenerated; and, inasmuch as Baptism (according to the just, though not exclusive, definition of the Anglican Church) is not only a *sign* but likewise an *instrument*, we are further bound, in the judgment of charity (a judgment, which we ought to be very cautious of changing at any future time), to deem and to declare morally regenerate all those, who shall have duly received, agreeably to Christ's institution, the Outward Washing of Baptism.

II. Nevertheless, while such language would, most probably, as most naturally, be adopted by the Church from the very beginning: it seems likely, that she would piously guard against any misapprehension of her language.

In early times, during the period of vehement persecution, few would become candidates for Baptism, who were not deeply and overwhelmingly impressed with the necessity of seeking a refuge from the wrath to come: and the Church was careful to admit none to the holy rite, save those who had passed through the probationary and educational state of Catechumens, and save those who might be justly hoped to have given the required *Answer* of a good conscience to the legitimate *Interrogation* propounded solemnly at the font.

Respecting the great bulk, then, of such promising individuals, there could be no reasonable doubt, that, to *them*, Outward Baptism was the mean of Perfect Moral Regeneration; being, as our Church expresses it, a confirmation and increase of the Imperfect Preparatory Faith and Grace, which had been anteriorly communicated to them by the Spirit, in order that they might thus *become*, what by nature they would not have *been*, worthy Recipients of the then effectually Renovating Sacrament: and thus, in primitive times, the generalising decision, that *Every baptised person was also a morally regenerated person*, would rarely prove inaccurate *.

Such, however, neither would, nor could be

* See Art. xxvii. I have stated, what, I think, is clearly enough the meaning of the Article: but, since by a captious objector it certainly may be thrown into some degree of per-

always the character of the decision. Cases (we

plexity, I shall take this opportunity of giving the matter a more extended discussion.

The perplexity, to which I allude, would stand thus.

A person, who receives Baptism, must needs be, either a Worthy Recipient, or an Unworthy Recipient.

If he be a Worthy Recipient, *already* possessing, as the twenty-seventh Article of the English Church describes him to possess, Faith and Grace: then he is *already* regenerated, inasmuch as the possession of Faith and Grace is the very badge and essence of Moral Regeneration; and, consequently, he cannot be *again* regenerated in Baptism.

But, if, on the other hand, he be an Unworthy Recipient, possessing neither Faith nor Grace: then, as the Anglican Church teaches after Primitive Antiquity, he will *not* be morally regenerated in Baptism; because, as her twenty-fifth Article states, the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper have a wholesome effect or operation in such only as *worthily* receive the same.

Thus, according to either part of the alternative, *Worthy Reception* or *Unworthy Reception*, Regeneration, as the Church of England with whatever consistency teaches in her Articles, *cannot* be communicated in and through Baptism.

This quibble evinces some ingenuity: and, as I recollect to have actually seen it drawn out in mood and form, perhaps its dissection may not be altogether devoid of utility.

In brief, the fallacy consists in a confounding together of *Difference of Degree* and *Sameness of Kind*.

The twenty-seventh Article, no doubt, speaks of Faith and Grace being *already* possessed by Worthy Recipients of Baptism; because it intimates, that, in Baptism, Faith is *confirmed* and Grace *increased* by virtue of prayer to God: and, no doubt, again, it must be admitted, that Faith and Grace are the very badge and essence of Moral Regeneration.

So far, we must plainly admit: but here comes in, what the

may instance that of Simon Magus, the regular quibble overlooks although distinctly pointed out in the twenty-seventh Article itself by the very terms *confirmed* and *increased*, the important question of *Degree*.

Perhaps, the fallacy will be the most intelligibly exhibited, and the apparent difficulty the most easily solved, by a recurrence to that System of Physics, from which our Lord's Metaphor of a New Birth is indisputably taken.

In Physics, we do not say, that the *Birth of a Child* and *Its Quickening in the Womb* must needs be *identical:* on the ground, that natural life is first received in the process of Quickening. We rather say, would we speak correctly, that an imperfect life is communicated to the child, *in order* to, and *in preparation* for, his Actual Nativity. This imperfect life we admit to be the same in *kind*, as that perfect life to which the Child is introduced at the season of his Birth; but then we say, that it differs in *Degree:* and the preparatory *Quickening* and the completed *Nativity*, so far from being *identical*, we pronounce to be entirely *distinct;* the one preceding and ushering in the other.

So, analogously, in Spirituals, we are not compelled to say, as the sophism before us would intimate, that the *Moral Preparation for a Worthy Reception of Baptism* must needs be identical with the *Moral Regeneration which is the Inward Grace of Baptism*. Whenever, in the course of God's sovereign will, Baptism is made the mean of Moral Regeneration: the *Spiritual Birth* conveyed through that mean is distinct from the *Spiritual Preparation* for it, though each moral process may be the same in *kind;* even as, in Physics, the preparatory *Quickening of a Child* is distinct from, and antecedent to, his *Natural Birth*.

The severe coldness of the present age, which, I believe, more or less affects every modern theologian, may doubt and quibble and dispute, whether, in strictness of speech, Baptism can ever be a mean of Moral Regeneration: and thence it may pronounce the allegation of such a mean to be nothing more

stock example of the old Fathers) would soon occur of a less satisfactory description: and those cases would multiply, as the season of Persecution

than a mere technicality, convenient, indeed, for the purpose of rotund doctrinal expression, but not to be taken in full and absolute literality. Yet the holy fervour of a better age, an age when the Catechumen approached to the Laver of Regeneration with his life (as it were) in his hand, thought not so: and the martyred Cyprian has actually left upon record, what, I suppose, good men in our days would call his EXPERIENCE, relative to the Moral Change produced in his soul by a sincere and humble and faithful Reception of the Ordinance of Outward Baptism. See above, book i. chap. 3. § I. 4.

Let me not here be mistaken. Certainly, no sober scripturist would ever dream of maintaining the portentous absurdity of what is called an *Opus Operatum*, as if a Moral Change of Disposition were *mechanically* produced by the mere external application of the Baptismal Water. But such folly has no analogy to the case of God *himself*, by his Spirit, operating through the medium or channel of a divinely appointed ordinance humbly submitted to in a devout temper of Faith and unreserved Obedience.

Lo, says Augustine, *it is Christ, who sanctifieth: it is Christ, who, by the Laver of Water, where his minister seems to operate corporally,* HIMSELF, *through the Word, washes,* HIMSELF *cleanses. Let no man arrogate, to his own efficiency, the sole property of God.*

Ecce, quia Christus sanctificat: ecce, quia Christus, ipso lavacro aquæ, in verbo, ubi minister videtur corporaliter operari, IPSE abluit, IPSE mundat. Nemo ergo sibi arroget, quod Dei est. August. cont. Liter. Petilian. Donat. lib. iii. c. 49. Oper. vol. vii. p. 124.

In truth, to adopt the phraseology of the Anglican Church in her twenty-seventh Article, the viewing Baptism as an *instru-*

passed away*. Hypocrites and infidels, under

ment through which GOD may be pleased to convey the Grace of Moral Regeneration to worthy Recipients is no more allied to the magic of an *Opus Operatum*, than the viewing the imposition of St. Paul's hands as the *instrument* through which GOD is expressly declared to have conveyed the spiritual gift which was in Timothy.

I put thee in remembrance, says the Apostle, *that thou stir up the gift of* GOD *which is in thee* THROUGH *the putting on of my hands.* 2 Tim. i. 6.

No sane person will imagine, that the naked act of imposition operated like a *charm*, or that St. Paul *himself* communicated the divine charisma. The very language of the Apostle distinctly intimates, that the imposition of his hands was nothing more than the mean *through* which GOD communicated the blessing in question. Of a precisely similar nature is Baptism, whenever GOD employs it as the mean *through* which Moral Regeneration is conveyed. The analogy, if I mistake not, is perfect.

* Καὶ γὰρ οὖν ἀληθῶς, δύο χαλεπὰ ταῦτα, κατὰ τοὺς δηλουμένους τούτους χρόνους, καὶ αὐτοὶ κατενοήσαμεν· ἐπιτριβὴν ἀπλήστων καὶ μοχθηρῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν ταῦτα λυμαινομένων βίον· εἰρωνείαντ' ἄλεκτον τῶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ὑποδυομένων, καὶ τὸ Χριστιανῶν ἐπιπλάστως σχηματιζομένων ὄνομα. Τὸ δ' αὐτοῦ φιλάνθρωπον καὶ φιλάγαθον, τό, τε τῆς πίστεως εἰλικρινὲς, καὶ τοῦ τρόπου τὸ φιλάληθες, ἀνῆγεν αὐτὸν πιστεύειν τῷ σχήματι τῶν Χριστιανῶν εἶναι νομιζομένων, εὐνοίαν τ' ἀληθῆ περὶ αὐτὸν πεπλασμένῃ ψυχῇ σώζειν προσποιουμένων. Euseb. de Vit. Constantin. lib. iv. c. 54. p. 457.

It might seem, from what the historian subjoins, that evil generally overtook these profane dissemblers in the holy Sacrament of Baptism: and *that* too so rapidly, as to induce a belief, that they were followed by divine vengeance.

Ἀλλὰ τοὺς μὲν, οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν, ἡ θεία μετήρχετο δικη. Ibid. c. 55.

simulated impressions which they felt not and which internally they ridiculed, might *offer* themselves for Baptism: and, when, in their instruction and preparatory examination, the Church had taken all the precautions in her power, she would *admit* them to Baptism; and, furthermore, when, with apparent seriousness, they had given the due *Answer* to the legitimate *Interrogation,* since she had not the power of reading the secret cogitations of the heart, she would, believing their *Answer* to be the requisite *Answer of a good conscience toward God,* charitably and unconsciously, pronounce *them* also, like her *real* children, to have been regenerated.

Yet, though such, of very necessity, would be her *outward* and *official* declaration; a declaration, like sentences in a Court of Law, pronounced upon what might justly be deemed sufficient *evidence:* can we suppose, that she would make no protest against the supposed contingency of these very possible cases? Are we to imagine, that the Sincere Church of Christ would *theoretically* teach, as sound doctrine, the alike Moral Regeneration of worthy and of unworthy Recipients, purely by the mechanical operation of Water applied in Baptism? It seems, *a priori,* difficult to believe, that any such extraordinary notion could have been attested and propounded, as the real mind of Scripture.

Hence, it further seems probable: that, while

the Church, in the *external* judgment of charity which hopeth all things and believeth all things, deemed and denominated all duly baptised persons morally regenerate; she would take effectual care to guard against any abuse of her charity, by declaring that Outward Baptism and Moral Regeneration were by no means inseparable, and by stating, as the ground of such declaration, that *none* received the grace of Moral Regeneration through the medium of Outward Baptism, save those who approached the laver with dispositions and intentions which might constitute them meet Recipients of the appointed holy Ordinance.

III. All this, I think, is, *in itself*, highly probable. Whether or not the probability be fact, or whether such an anticipation of the language of the Early Church be or be not verified by the language itself, can only be ascertained by a due examination of the documents which we possess.

Meanwhile, before we proceed to the examination at large, it may be useful to bring forward a very remarkable attestation to the precise PRINCIPLE, on which, according to my own supposition, the Church has always *officially* acknowledged the duly baptised to be also morally regenerated.

For the testimony in question, we are indebted to Clement of Alexandria, who flourished about the end of the second century. His technical language, it may be proper to observe, is, throughout, that of the ancient Mysteries. In this phra-

seology, *Illumination* is *Moral Regeneration viewed as officially associated with Baptism:* and *Baptism* itself, under the same two-fold aspect, is *Perfection* or *Initiation* *.

Having thus propounded Baptism, as the ordinary mean or channel of Moral Regeneration; and having precluded all doubt, in regard to the Regeneration of which *he* treats being a Moral Change of Disposition, by declaring that the manners and habits of the person illuminated are no longer the same as they previously were: he then goes on to specify the GROUND or PRINCIPLE, on which the Church, in her public service, defined Regeneration to take place at Baptism. The PRINCIPLE was this: no other actual moment could be ascertained, with a sufficiency of tangible distinctness, to warrant an official declaration, that this or that person had been morally regenerated by the Spirit.

Being baptised, we are illuminated: being illuminated, we are made Sons of God: being made Sons of God, we are initiated: being initiated, we become immortal. It is written: I have said, ye are gods; and ye are all the sons of the Most High.

But this work is distinguished by various different

* For an account of the discipline and language of the ancient Christian Mysteries, see my Apostolicity of Trinitarianism, book i. chap. 8, and my Difficulties of Romanism, b. ii. chap. 4. § VI.

names: such, as, THE FREE GIFT, *and* ILLUMINATION, *and* INITIATION, *and* BAPTISM.

It is called BAPTISM *or* WASHING; *because, through it, we wash away our sins: it is called* THE FREE GIFT; *because through it, the just punishment due to sins is remitted: it is called* ILLUMINATION; *because, through it, the holy and saving light is beheld, that is to say, through it, we clearly behold the Deity: it is called* INITIATION *or* PERFECTION; *because, through it, we declare that nothing is wanting.—*

If, then, a person be only regenerated and illuminated, he is immediately freed from darkness, and thenceforward has received light.—

This one grace appertains to Illumination: that the manners and habits of the person illuminated should no longer be the same, as they were before he was washed in Baptism.

But, because knowledge shines forth concurrently with Illumination, blazing throughout the entire mind like lightning; and because we, who before were ignorant, immediately hear ourselves called Disciples: did this take place, when that christian instruction was imparted to us by the Catechist?

TRULY, YOU CANNOT DETERMINE THE EXACT TIME.

For Catechetical Instruction conducts to Faith: and Faith, along with Baptism, is taught by the Holy Spirit.—All, who have put off the lusts of the flesh, are equal and spiritual in the sight of the

*Lord.—We, then, having repented, and having (as it were) been percolated through the strainer of Baptism, run to the Eternal Light, as children to their father.—Justly, therefore, are we the Sons of God: inasmuch as we have thrown off the Old Man, and have cast away the garment of wickedness, and have put on the incorruptibility of Christ; in order that, being made a New and Holy People, we, thus regenerated, may henceforth keep our humanity unpolluted *.*

* Βαπτιζόμενοι, φωτιζόμεθα· φωτιζόμενοι, υἱοποιούμεθα· υἱοποιούμενοι, τελειούμεθα· τελούμενοι, ἀποθανατιζόμεθα. Ἔγω, φήσιν, εἶπα· Θεοὶ ἐστε, καὶ υἱοὶ Ὑψίστου πάντες.

Καλεῖται δὲ πολλαχῶς τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο· Χάρισμα, καὶ Φώτισμα, καὶ Τέλειον, καὶ Λουτρὸν.

Λουτρὸν μὲν, δι' οὗ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀποῤῥυπτόμεθα· Χάρισμα δὲ, ᾧ τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν ἐπιτίμια ἀνεῖται· Φώτισμα δὲ, δι' οὗ τὸ ἅγιον ἐκεῖνο φῶς σωτήριον ἐποπτεύεται, τουτέστιν, δι' οὗ τὸ Θεῖον ὀξυωποῦμεν· Τέλειον δὲ, τὸ ἀπρόσδεες φαμὲν.—

Καὶ ὁ μόνον ἀναγεννηθεὶς, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ τοὔνομα ἔχει, καὶ φωτισθεὶς, ἀπήλλακται μὲν παραχρῆμα τοῦ σκότους, ἀπείληφε δὲ αὐτόθεν τὸ φῶς.—

Μία χάρις αὕτη τοῦ Φωτίσματος, τὸ μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι, τῷ πρὶν ἢ λούσασθαι, τὸν τρόπον.

Ὅτι δὲ ἡ γνῶσις συνανατέλλει τῷ Φωτίσματι, περιαστράπτουσα τὸν νοῦν, καὶ εὐθέως ἀκούομεν, μαθηταὶ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς· πότερον πότε, τῆς μαθήσεως ἐκείνης προσγενομένης;

Οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔχοις εἰπεῖν τὸν χρόνον.

Ἡ μὲν γὰρ κατήχησις εἰς πίστιν περιάγει· πίστις δὲ, ἅμα τῷ βαπτίσματι, Ἁγίῳ παιδεύεται Πνεύματι.—Οἱ πάντες, ἀποθέμενοι τὰς σαρκικὰς ἐπιθυμίας, ἴσοι καὶ πνευματικοὶ παρὰ τῷ Κυρίῳ.—Καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἐπὶ τοῖς προημαρτημένοις μετανενοήκοτες, ἀποταξάμενοι τοῖς ἐλαττώμασιν αὐτῶν, διυλιζόμενοι βαπτίσματι, καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀΐδιον ἀνατρέχομεν

The passage is very remarkable: and, as a key, it is well worth our serious attention. It points out the REASON, why, in her official declaration at the font, the Early Church, passing over the other scripturally defined means of Regeneration, confines herself to the no less scripturally defined mean of Outward Baptism. This last, so far as the judgment of man is concerned, is the SOLE *tangible* and *sensible* mean. With respect to the others, as Clement says, TRULY YOU CANNOT DETERMINE THE EXACT TIME. Hence, obviously, they never could form the basis of a public *official* declaration.

φῶς, οἱ παῖδες πρὸς τὸν πάτερα.—Ἆρα εἰκότως οἱ παῖδες τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἱ τὸν παλαιὸν ἀποθέμενοι ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τῆς κακίας ἐκδυσάμενοι τὸν χιτῶνα, ἐπενδυσάμενοι δὲ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα, καινὸς γενόμενος λαὸς ἅγιος, ἀναγεννήθεντες, ἀμίαντον φυλάξωμεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Clem. Alex. Pædag. lib. i. c. 6. Oper. p. 93, 95, 96.

CHAPTER VI.

STATEMENTS OF THE EARLY FATHERS RESPECTING THE CONCOMITANCE OF MORAL REGENERATION UPON OUTWARD BAPTISM VIEWED AS A MEAN OR CHANNEL.

That *The early Fathers perpetually associate Moral Regeneration with Outward Baptism, describing Outward Baptism as the sensible or visible or cognizable mean, through which, to the devout Recipient, the Blessed Spirit of God communicates the grace of Moral Regeneration*, no person, even moderately acquainted with their writings, can be ignorant.

So notorious, indeed, is the circumstance, that it is frequently alleged, as a full demonstration that the Doctrine of INSEPARABILITY was held by the Primitive Church, and as a satisfactory proof that in the purest ages no *other* mean of Regeneration than Outward Baptism was ever known or imagined.

This matter being thus universally acknowledged, I might perhaps have been excused the

labour of adducing, in testimony to an indisputable fact, even any formal citations from the old ecclesiastical writers. But, since I contend from Scripture that Baptism is at least *one* mean of Regeneration, and since my evidence from Antiquity would be defective if *no* testimony to this particular point were produced, I shall here give, certainly not the *whole* which the early Fathers have stated on the subject, but, what will answer every useful purpose, a sufficient number of *specimens*.

I. Let us begin, then, with attending to the evidence of Justin Martyr.

Whosoever shall have been persuaded, and shall believe the matters to be true which by us are taught and propounded, and shall promise that they will live accordingly: these persons are instructed to supplicate God with fasting that their former sins may be forgiven, we ourselves jointly praying and fasting along with them. Then they are brought by us to a place where there is Water: and they are regenerated, after the fashion of the Regeneration in which we also ourselves were regenerated: for, in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things and of our Saviour Jesus Christ and of the Holy Ghost, they undergo the Washing which is in the Water; Christ himself having said, Unless you be born again, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven *.

* Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν

II. Next we may hear the testimony of Irenèus, who was a partial contemporary with Justin, each of them flourishing in the second century.

*Committing to his disciples the power of Regeneration, Christ said unto them: Go, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost. For, through the prophets, he promised: that, in the last times, he would pour out this Spirit upon his servants and his hand-maids, that they should prophesy. Whence also this same Spirit descended upon the Son of God made the son of man, with him becoming accustomed to dwell in the human race and to rest in men and to take up his abode in the creature of God, working in them the will of the Father, and renewing them from Oldness to Newness in Christ *.*

διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βιοῦν οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται· εὔχεσθαι τε καὶ αἰτεῖν, νηστεύοντες, παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς. Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστι· καὶ, τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται· ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν, Ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐράνων. Justin. Apol. i. Oper. p. 73.

* Potestatem Regenerationis demandans discipulis, dicebat eis: *Euntes, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti.* Hunc enim promisit, per prophetas, effundere se, in novissimis temporibus, super servos et ancillas, ut prophetent. Unde et in Filium Dei, filium hominis factum, descendit, cum ipso assuescens habitare in genere humano et requiescere in hominibus et habitare in plas-

III. To the same purpose speaks Clement of Alexandria, somewhat later than Irenèus.

Our teacher Christ, as it appears to me, formed man of Earth, regenerated him by Water, gave him increase by the Spirit, and instructed him by the Word.*

IV. To a similar purpose, again, speaks Tertullian, the contemporary of Clement.

Happy is the Sacrament of Water: because, when the sins of our former blindness have been washed away, we are liberated into eternal life.— There is nothing which so hardens the minds of men, as the very simplicity of the divine works when they are seen in actual operation, and as the magnificent result which is promised in the way of effect: so that here also, when, with such simplicity devoid of all pomp and bustle and expence, a man, plunged into the Water and immersed with only a few words, rises again little or nothing cleaner in his person than he was before, his attainment of eternity through such a medium may well be thought incredible.— We also wonder: but it is, because we believe.

mate Dei, voluntatem Patris operans in ipsis, et renovans eos a vetustate in novitatem Christi. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iii. c. 19. p. 207.

It will be observed, that Irenèus, like the other Fathers, here uses *Renovation* as synonymous with *Regeneration*. See above, b. i. chap. 5. § I. note.

* Καὶ μοι δοκεῖ αὐτος οὗτος, πλάσαι μὲν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ χοὸς, ἀναγεννῆσαι δὲ ὕδατι, αὐξῆσαι δὲ Πνεύματι, παιδαγωγῆσαι δὲ ῥήματι. Clem. Alex. Pædag. lib. i. c. 12. Oper. p. 133.

Unbelief likewise wonders: but it is, because it believes not.—All Water, from the ancient prerogative of its origin, attains, when God is invoked, to be the Sacrament of Sanctification. For the Spirit immediately comes upon it from heaven; and, thus brooding over it, sanctifies it from himself: so that, when sanctified, it drinks in the virtue of sanctifying.—Thus, guilt being taken away, punishment is taken away also: and thus man, who had formerly been created after the image of God, will be restored to God according to his similitude.—For he receives the Spirit of God, whom by his breathing into him he had received at his first creation, but whom through sin he had afterward lost: not that we obtain the Holy Spirit in the mere Water; but, being cleansed under the angel in the Water, we are prepared by the Holy Spirit.*

* Felix sacramentum aquæ nostræ: quia, ablutis delictis pristinæ cæcitatis, in vitam æternam liberamur.—Nihil adeo est quod obduret mentes hominum, quam simplicitas divinorum operum quæ in actu videntur, et magnificentia quæ in effectu repromittitur: ut hic quoque, quoniam tanta simplicitate, sine pompa, sine apparatu novo aliquo, denique sine sumptu, homo, in aqua demissus et inter pauca verba tinctus, non multo vel nihilo mundior resurgit, eo incredibilis existimetur consecutio æternitatis.—Nos quoque ipsi miramur: sed quia credimus. Cæterum incredulitas miratur: non credit.—Omnes aquæ, de pristina originis prærogativa, sacramentum sanctificationis consequuntur, invocato Deo. Supervenit enim statim Spiritus de cœlis et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semetipso: et, ita sanctificatæ, vim sanctificandi combibunt.—Exempto scilicet reatu, eximitur et pœna. Ita restituetur homo Deo, ad simili-

V. The statement of Cyprian, about the middle of the third century, still attests the continued reception of the same doctrine.

That Baptism is the mean, through which the Old Man dies and the New Man is born, the blessed Apostle manifests and proves, when he says: He hath saved us through the Washing of Regeneration.—Furthermore, when a person receives the Holy Spirit, he is born, not through imposition of the hand, but in Baptism; that now, being born, he may receive the Spirit, as the same took place in the first man Adam: for God first formed him; and then breathed into his face the breath of life *.

VI. To a similar purpose also speaks Athanasius, about the middle of the fourth century.

He, that is baptised, puts off the Old Man: and,

tudinem ejus, qui retro ad imaginem Dei fuerat.—Recipit enim illum Dei Spiritum, quem tunc de afflatu ejus acceperat, sed post amiserat per delictum: non quod in aquis Spiritum Sanctum consequamur; sed, in aqua emundati sub angelo, Spiritu Sancto præparamur. Tertull. de Baptism. Oper. p. 703, 704, 705.

* Baptisma enim esse, in quo homo vetus moritur et novus nascitur, manifestat et probat beatus Apostolus, dicens: *Salvavit nos per lavacrum regenerationis.*—Porro autem, non per manus impositionem quis nascitur, quando accipit Spiritum Sanctum, sed in baptismo; ut Spiritum jam natus accipiat, sicut in primo homine factum est: ante enim Deus eum plasmavit; et tunc insufflavit in faciem ejus flatum vitæ. Cyprian. Epist. lxxiv. Oper. vol. ii. p. 213.

So familiar, indeed, was the doctrine, that Cyprian, in the

as being born from above, is renewed by the grace of the Spirit *.

VII. The very same doctrine was inculcated, about the same time, in his office of Public Catechist, by Cyril of Jerusalem: both upon the Catechumens whom he was preparing for Baptism, and upon the Mystæ who had now received Baptism.

Great is the Baptism, which lies before you: a Ransom to the Captives; a Remission of Offences; the Death of Sin; the Regeneration of the Soul †.

You were conducted to the Holy Laver of Divine Baptism, as Christ was conveyed from the cross to the tomb provided for him: and each one of you was asked, if he believed in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. And you confessed the saving confession: and you were thrice plunged into the Water, and you thrice emerged from it, symbolically exhibiting the trihemeral continuance of Christ in the sepulchre.—

course of the same passage, employs it to establish his favourite opinion, that Baptism administered by heretics is invalid.

Si autem in lavacro, id est, in baptismo, regeneratio: quomodo generare filios Dei hæresis per Christum potest, quæ Christi sponsa non est?

* Ὁ δὲ βαπτιζόμενος τὸν μὲν παλαιὸν ἀπεκδιδύσκεται· ἀνακαινίζεται δὲ, ὡς ἄνωθεν γεννηθεὶς, τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτι. Athan. in illud Evan. Quicunque dixerit. Oper. vol. i. p. 767.

† Μέγα τὸ προκείμενον βάπτισμα· αἰχμαλώτοις, λύτρον· ἁμαρτημάτων, ἄφεσις· θάνατος, ἁμαρτίας· παλιγγενέσια, ψυχῆς. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. Proëm. p. viii.

Thus you, at once, died and were born again: and that Salutary Water was to you, at once, both a tomb and a mother *.

VIII. To the same effect also, touching the instrumental connection of Outward Baptism with Moral Regeneration, spoke Ambrose in the latter part of the fourth century.

Through the Sacrament of Baptism, Christ operates this great change: namely, that each one should put off that in which he was born naturally, and should put on that into which he is born again spiritually †.

IX. So, again, Jerome, about the end of the fourth century, still bore witness to the ecclesiastical reception of the same doctrine.

Spiritual Generation needs the Salutary Washing: for No one is clean from filth, even though he has lived but a single day. In the Psalms also we read: I was born in iniquity; and in sin did my

* Μετὰ ταῦτα, ἐπὶ τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ θείου βαπτίσματος ἐχειραγωγεῖσθε κολυμβήθραν, ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον μνῆμα· καὶ ἠρωτᾶτο ἕκαστος, εἰ πιστεύει εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Καὶ ὡμολογήσατε τὴν σωτήριον ὁμολογίαν· καὶ κατεδύετε τρίτον εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ πάλιν ἀνεδύετε, καὶ ἐνταῦθα, διὰ συμβόλου, τὴν τριήμερον τοῦ Χριστοῦ αἰνιττόμενοι ταφήν.— Καὶ, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, ἀπεθνήσκετε καὶ ἐγέννᾶσθε· καὶ τὸ σωτήριον ἔκεινο ὕδωρ, καὶ τάφος ὑμῖν ἐγίνετο, καὶ μήτηρ. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. Mystag. ii. p. 232.

† Hoc, per Baptismatis Sacramentum, Christus operatur: ut exuat unusquisque quod natus est, induat quod renatus. Ambros. Enarr. in Psalm. xxxvi. § 63. Oper. vol. i. col. 806.

mother conceive me. The Second Birth dissolves the First Birth. For it is written: Unless a man be born again of Water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God *.

X. Finally, we may hear Augustine, at the beginning of the fifth century.

The infernal poisoner struck the whole mass of mankind in the first man. No one passes to the second man from the first, except through the Sacrament of Baptism. In Children born and not yet baptised, let Adam be acknowledged: in Children born and baptised and on this account regenerated, let Christ be acknowledged †.

* Generatio spiritualis lavacro indiget salutari. *Nullus* enim *mundus a sorde, nec si unius quidem dici fuerit vita ejus.* Et in Psalmis legimus: *In iniquitatibus conceptus sum; et in delictis concepit me mater mea.* Secunda nativitas solvit primam nativitatem. Scriptum est enim: *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non potest intrare in regnum Dei.* Hieron. Comment. in Ezech. xvi. 4. Oper. vol. iv. p. 368.

† Universam massam generis humani, in homine primo, venenator ille percussit. Nemo ad secundum transit a primo, nisi per baptismatis sacramentum. In parvulis natis et nondum baptizatis, agnoscatur Adam: in parvulis natis et baptizatis et ob hoc renatis, agnoscatur Christus. August. de Verb. Apost. serm. viii. c. 8. Oper. vol. x. p. 99.

CHAPTER VII.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENTS OF THE EARLY FATHERS.

But, while the early Fathers, in perfect accordance with Scripture, represent Baptism, as an appointed mean or channel through which Moral Regeneration is communicated: are we thence to understand, that, in their testimony as to the true sense of Holy Writ, Outward Baptism and Moral Regeneration must be deemed absolutely INSEPARABLE; so that, where Outward Baptism *is*, there *also is* Moral Regeneration; and, where Outward Baptism *is not*, there *neither is* Moral Regeneration?

Before we come to any hasty decision from the evidence which has hitherto been received, it seems only reasonable to hear their own explanatory statements.

Now, on this point, a remarkable passage in Clement of Alexandria, which has already been

adduced, may serve, in the way of a first principle, to throw a considerable degree of light*.

It was found impossible, as Clement speaks, to *determine the exact time*, when Christian knowledge and Divine Illumination were, like *a blaze of lightning*, imparted to the previously dark and ignorant soul of the Unregenerate†. Hence, on the ground of this *Impossibility of Precise Determination*, the time of Baptism was *generically* assumed to be the time of Regeneration: and, hence, every baptised person, when, to the *Legitimate Ecclesiastical Interrogation*, such person had given what was charitably deemed the *Answer of a good conscience toward God*, was publicly pronounced and acknowledged to have been born again.

Such, then, according to Clement, was the true *rationalè* or *principle* of that generalising official declaration, which the Church was accustomed to make from the very beginning. The mean of *Outward Baptism* was cognizable by the Church and her Functionaries: but the two other scripturally specified means of *A Believing Reception of Christ* and of *The Revealed Word of God*, upon which last mean was based the whole System of Catechetical Instruction, were, very obviously and of plain necessity, *not* similarly cognizable.

* See above, book ii. chap. 5. § III.

† Gr. περιαστράπτουσα τὸν νοῦν, and οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔχοις εἰπεῖν τὸν χρόνον.

With this remarkable intimation in our hand, which may well serve as a key to the language of Ancient Theology, we may proceed, not devoid of encouragement, in the task of examination which at present lies before us.

Let us, then, hear the explanatory statements of the early Fathers, as they respect the case of individuals, who have indeed outwardly received the Sacrament of Baptism, but who have received it insincerely and unworthily.

I. Of these we happily have a number, quite sufficient to set the present question at rest.

1. Justin's interesting account of the primitive administration of Baptism we have already perused *. He there, without hesitation, speaks of the Inward Grace duly attending upon and following the reception of the Outward Sign. Yet, I suppose, Justin's words must, in all equity, be taken and understood agreeably to his own explanatory qualification.

Through the Washing of Repentance and of the knowledge of God which took place for the iniquity of God's people, as Isaiah loudly proclaims, we believe and make known: that that very Baptism long since declared by him, which alone can purify the penitent, is the true Water of Life; while the cisterns, which you Jews hew out to yourselves, are broken and unprofitable. For what advantage is

* See above, book i. chap. 3. § I. 1.

*there in that Baptism, which cleanses only the flesh and the body? Be baptised, as to your Soul, from anger and avarice, from envy and hatred: and then, behold the Body also is clean. For that is the symbol involved in the ordinance of unleavened bread: to wit, that ye should not do the ancient works of the evil leaven. But ye understand all things after a carnal manner: and ye deem it piety, if you duly perform such things; while yet, in your souls, you are filled with deceit and wickedness *.*

From this language of Justin, I see not what we can learn, save, that, if Christians depended upon any imaginary mechanical operation of Baptism, as Jews depended upon an imaginary mechanical operation of their numerous ablutions, the result in each case would be the same. Let Baptism be received superstitiously or unworthily:

* Διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ οὖν τῆς μετανοίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀνομίας τῶν λαῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ γέγονεν, ὡς Ἡσαΐας βοᾷ, ἡμεῖς ἐπιστεύσαμεν καὶ γνωρίζομεν, ὅτι τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνο, ὁ προηγόρευε, τὸ βάπτισμα, τὸ μόνον καθαρίσαι τοὺς μετανοησάντας δυνάμενον, τοῦτο ἐστι τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς ζωῆς· οὓς δὲ ὑμεῖς ὠρύξατε λάκκους ἑαυτοῖς, συντετριμμένοι εἰσὶ καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμῖν χρήσιμοι. Τί γὰρ ὄφελος ἐκείνου τοῦ βαπτίσματος, ὁ τὴν σάρκα καὶ μόνον τὸ σῶμα φαιδρύνει; Βαπτίσθητε τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀπὸ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀπὸ πλεονεξίας, ἀπὸ φθονου, ἀπὸ μίσους· καὶ, ἰδοὺ, τὸ σῶμα καθαρὸν ἐστι. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστι σύμβολον τῶν ἀξύμων, ἵνα μὴ τὰ παλαιὰ τῆς κακῆς ζύμης ἔργα πράττητε. Ὑμεῖς δὲ πάντα σαρκικῶς νενοήκατε· καὶ ἡγεῖσθε εὐσέβειαν, ἐὰν, τοιαῦτα ποιοῦντες, τὰς ψυχὰς μεμεστωμένοι ἦτε δόλου καὶ πάσης κακίας ἁπλῶς. Justin. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 178, 179.

and, under such an error, no more spiritually beneficial effect would be produced by it, than was produced by the various washings upon which the Jews so confidently depended. Unless the Soul be baptised from anger and avarice, from hatred and malice, Outward Baptism has altogether failed. The *Sign*, indeed, has been administered: but the *Thing signified*, by reason of unworthy reception, has not been attendant.

In the opinion, then, of Justin, and thus, we may fairly conclude, in the opinion also of the Catholic Church a few years only after the death of St. John, no Moral Regeneration would attend upon even the most regular administration of Outward Baptism, if the candidate should hypocritically present himself with the dispositions reprobated in the Jews, and if his *Answer* should be any thing rather than the *Answer of a good conscience toward God.*

2. Tertullian, like Justin, associates Moral Regeneration with Outward Baptism. Yet, before we absolutely pronounce upon his statement, it were only prudent to hear his explanation.

A true and stable faith is, by water, baptised to salvation: a simulated and infirm faith is, by fire, baptised to judgment *.

This statement, which makes the beneficial effect of Baptism to depend altogether upon the faith and sincerity of the Recipient, plainly sets

* Vera et stabilis aquæ fides, qua tingitur in salutem: simu-

forth, that no Moral Regeneration, but, on the contrary, assured condemnation, if the dissembler remain impenitent, follows after an unworthy participation of the Sacrament of Baptism.

3. In a similar manner, the opinion of Jerome must not be rapidly settled as favouring the doctrine of *Inseparability*, ere we have given him some reasonable time and opportunity to explain himself.

It is added: Thou art not washed in water unto salvation. *Now, in the way of application, this may be understood, not only of heretics, but also of those members of the sound Catholic Church, who receive not Baptism with full faith in any salutary manner. Of these, it must be said: that they received the Water indeed, but did not receive the Spirit. Such was the case of Simon Magus, who would fain have purchased the Grace of God with money. He was baptised, indeed, in the Water: but he was, in no wise, baptised unto Salvation*.*

If any one has received only that Washing,

lata autem et infirma igni tingitur in judicium. Tertull. in Baptism. Oper. p. 707.

The same is implied, though not directly expressed, in another part of the same Work of Tertullian.

Si qui pondus intelligant Baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem quam dilationem: fides integra secura est de salute. Ibid. p. 711.

* Additum est: *Et in aqua non es lota in salutem.* Quod quidem, non solum de hæreticis, sed de ecclesiasticis, intelligi potest, qui non plena fide accipiunt baptisma salutare. De

which is of the body and which is seen by the eyes of the flesh, he hath not put on the Lord Jesus Christ. For Simon also, in the Acts of the Apostles, had received the Washing of Water: but he had not put on Christ, because he had not received the Holy Spirit. Heretics, likewise, or hypocrites, or profligates, appear, indeed, to receive Baptism: but it may well be doubted, whether they have the putting on of Christ.*

The purport of this explanation cannot, I suppose, be misapprehended. Jerome distinctly maintains the possibility of a man being baptised *without* being also morally regenerated.

4. The same privilege of self-explanation must likewise be conceded to Ambrose.

I see water, which I am in the habit of seeing daily. Can this cleanse me, into which I have

quibus dicendum est, quod acceperint aquam, sed non acceperint Spiritum: sicut et Simon ille Magus, qui pecunia volebat redimere gratiam Dei, baptizatus quidem est in aqua, sed nequaquam baptizatus est in salutem. Hieron. Comment. in Ezech. xvi. 4. Oper. vol. iv. p. 368.

* Si quis hoc corporeum, et quod oculis carnis inspicitur, aquæ tantum accepit lavacrum, non est indutus Dominum Jesum Christum. Nam et Simon ille, de Actibus Apostolorum, acceperat lavacrum aquæ: verum, quia Spiritum Sanctum non habebat, indutus non est Christum. Et hæretici, vel hypocritæ, et hi qui sordidè victitant, videntur quidem accipere baptismum: sed nescio an Christi habeant indumentum. Hieron. Comment. in Galat. iii. 27. Oper. vol. vi. p. 137.

The *Putting on of Christ* is only, in different phraseology, the *Grace of Moral Regeneration.*

often descended, and have never been cleansed? Learn hence, that Water cleanses not without the Spirit.—

In this faith, then, hold the order and succession of the matters. Thou hast died to the world: and thou hast risen again unto God: and, when dead to sin, being as it were buried along with it in that element of the world, thou hast been raised up again to life eternal. Believe, therefore, that the use of water is not a mere empty ceremonial.—

Now all are healed; or, at least, one sole Christian People: for, in some, even water is mendacious. The Baptism, which is administered to perfidious dissemblers, heals them not. So far from cleansing, it only pollutes them *.

5. Augustine also, no less than his fellows, must be allowed to explain his own meaning.

Simon Magus, because he sought his own things and not the things of Jesus Christ (whence, among the Christians, he had loved power rather than

* Aquas video, quas videbam quotidie. Istæ me habent mundare, in quas sæpe descendi, et nunquam mundatus sum? Hinc cognosce, quod aqua non mundat sine Spiritu.—

Tene ordinem rerum in hac fide. Mundo mortuus es; et Deo resurrexisti: et, quasi in illo mundi consepultus elemento, peccato mortuus, ad vitam es resuscitatus æternam. Crede, ergo, quia, non sunt vacuæ aquæ.—

Nunc omnes sanantur; aut certè unus solus populus christianus: est enim, in aliquibus, et aqua mendax. Non sanat Baptismus perfidorum: non mundat, sed polluit. Ambros. de Myster. c. iv. Oper. vol. ii. col. 330.

righteousness), was, within the pale of the Church, not a dove, but a raven. This person saw, that, through the imposition of the hands of the Apostles, the Holy Spirit was given: not, however, that they gave it, but that it was given to them in consequence of their praying for it. Hence he said to the Apostles: What money will ye receive from me, that, through the imposition of my hands also, the Holy Spirit may be given. *But Peter said to him:* Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be bought with money. *To whom was it, that he said:* Thy money perish with thee? *Truly he said so, to a baptised person. Baptism Simon had: but he adhered not to the bowels of the dove. Hear, why he did not adhere. Mark the very words of the Apostle Peter. It follows:* There is neither part nor lot to thee in this faith; I see thee to be in the gall of bitterness. *Now the dove has no gall. Simon had. Therefore was he separated from the bowels of the dove. What did Baptism profit him? Glory not, then, concerning Baptism: as if, from it, there were a sufficiency of Salvation to thee. Cease from anger. Lay aside gall. Come to the dove. Here Baptism will benefit thee: but, extraneously to good dispositions, so far from profiting, it is even injurious*.*

* Simon ille, qui non erat in Ecclesia columba sed corvus, quia ea quæ sua sunt quærebat non quæ Jesu Christi, unde in Christianis potentiam magis amaverat quam justitiam, vidit per

Though all Sacraments were common, yet not common to all Recipients was that Grace which is the Virtue of Sacraments. Thus likewise now, when the Faith, which under the Law was veiled, has become fully unveiled; the Washing, indeed, of Regeneration is common to all who have been baptised in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: but the Grace itself, whereof the Sacraments are Sacraments; that Grace, by which the Members of Christ's Body are, along with their Head, regenerated; is not common to all. For heretics, and false brethren in the Communion of the Catholic Name, have the same Baptism as others *.

impositionem manuum Apostolorum dari Spiritum Sanctum; non quia ipsi dabant, sed quia ipsis orantibus datus est: et ait Apostolis; *Quid vultis a me accipere pecuniæ, ut et, per impositionem manuum, mearum, detur Spiritus Sanctus?* Et ait illi Petrus: *Pecunia tua tecum sit in perditionem, quoniam donum Dei putasti pecunia comparandum.* Cui dicit: *Pecunia tua tecum sit in perditionem?* Utique baptizato. Jam baptisma habebat: sed columbæ visceribus non hærebat. Audi, quia non hærebat. Verba ipsa Petri Apostoli adverte; sequitur enim; *Non est tibi pars neque sors in hac fide, in felle enim amaritudinis video te esse.* Columba fel non habet. Simon habebat. Ideo separatus erat a columbæ visceribus. Baptisma illi quid proderat? Noli ergo de baptismate gloriari, quasi ex ipso salus tibi sufficiat. Noli irasci: depone fel: veni ad columbam. Hic tibi proderit, quod foris non solum non proderat, sed etiam oberat. August. Expos. in Evan. Joan. Tractat. vi. Oper. vol. ix. p. 19.

* Cum essent omnia communia sacramenta, non communis

Love alone constitutes the distinction, between the sons of God, and the sons of the Devil. Let all, ever so devoutly, sign themselves with the sign of the cross of Christ; let all duly answer, Amen; let all sing, Hallelujah; let all be, ever so regularly, baptised; let all be constant in their attendance upon public worship in the Churches; let all unsparingly disburse their substance in building the walls of Cathedrals: still the sons of God are not distinguished from the sons of the Devil, except by Charity. They, who have Charity, have been born of God: and they, who have it not, have not been born of God.*

On the whole, it is collected: that, without visible Sacraments, invisible Sanctification has, to some persons, been present and profitable. For, accord-

crat omnibus gratia quæ sacramentorum virtus est. Sicut et nunc, jam revelata fide quæ tunc velabatur, omnibus in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti baptizatis commune est lavacrum Regenerationis: sed ipsa gratia, cujus ipsa sunt sacramenta, qua membra corporis Christi cum suo capite regenerata sunt, non communis est omnibus. Nam et hæretici habent eundem baptismum, et falsi fratres in communione catholici nominis. August. Enarr. in Psalm lxxvii. Oper. vol. viii. p. 306.

* Dilectio ergo sola discernit, inter filios Dei, et filios Diaboli. Signent se omnes signo crucis Christi; respondeant omnes, Amen; cantent omnes, Hallelujah; baptizentur omnes; intrent ecclesias; faciant parietes basilicarum: non discernuntur filii Dei a filiis Diaboli, nisi charitate. Qui habent charitatem, nati sunt ex Deo; qui non habent, non sunt nati ex Deo. August. in 1 Epist. Joan. Tractat. v. Oper. vol. ix. p. 220.

ing to the diversity of the times, visible Sacraments have been externally changed: so that of old they bore one outward form, while now they bear another outward form. But that visible Sanctification, which is conferred through visible Sacraments, may be present without the concomitancy of invisible Sanctification: though, without the concomitancy of invisible Sanctification, it cannot profit. Yet the visible Sacrament is not, on that account, to be despised: for its despiser can, in no wise, be invisibly sanctified. Hence Cornelius and they who were with him, when they appeared to have been invisibly sanctified by the infusion of the Holy Spirit, were nevertheless baptised: nor was the visible Sanctification deemed superfluous, because the invisible Sanctification had already preceded it.*

* Proinde colligitur: invisibilem Sanctificationem quibusdam affuisse atque profuisse, sine visibilibus. Sacramentis; quæ, pro temporum diversitate, mutata sunt, ut alia tunc fuerint, et alia modo sint: visibilem vero Sanctificationem, quæ fieret per visibilia Sacramenta, sine ista invisibili, posse adesse, non posse prodesse. Nec tamen ideo sacramentum visibile contemnendum est: nam contemptor ejus invisibiliter sanctificari nullo modo potest. Hinc est, quod Cornelius et qui cum eo erant, cum jam invisibiliter, infuso Spiritu Sancto, sanctificati apparerent, baptizati sunt tamen: nec superflua indicata est visibilis Sanctificatio, quam invisibilis jam præcesserat. August. Quæst. super Levit. lib. iii. quæst. 84. Oper. vol. iv. p. 88.

It will readily be perceived, that the statement in this passage, relative to the *notional* identity of the corresponding Sacraments Levitical and Christian, however, under different Dispensations, they may have borne different external *forms*, is

Take the case of those persons, who, whether they be already spiritual, or whether, being still nourished with milk as little ones, they are with intent heart profiting toward the spiritual habit, are thence so in the house of God that they may be viewed as constituting the house of God. Respecting these individuals, there can be no doubt, but that they may both usefully receive Baptism themselves, and deliver it usefully to such as imitate them. But still, though, so far as in them lies, they may, relatively to their own ministration and purpose, usefully deliver it to hypocritical dissemblers whom the Holy Spirit flees from: those same hypocritical dissemblers, not imitating the persons through whom they receive it, on that account receive it uselessly. And it may yet further be observed, that those per-

precisely the same as that, which, from the testimony of venerable Antiquity, I have felt myself warranted in adopting. Circumcision and Baptism are *notionally* the same: though, as Augustine speaks, their *visible Sacraments* have been externally changed according to the diversity of the times. See above, book ii. chap. 3. § II. 1.

I may add: that, in what immediately precedes the present passage, Augustine argues the case of the penitent thief precisely as I have done. See above, book ii. chap. 4. § III. 2. The thief had never received the visible Sacrament of Baptism: yet he must have been sanctified by Regeneration, because, otherwise, the felicity of Paradise could never have been bestowed upon him.

Hoc et, de latrone illo, cui, secum crucifixo, Dominus ait: *Hodie mecum eris in Paradiso.* Neque enim, sine Sanctificatione invisibili, tanta felicitate donatus est.

sons, who are so in a great house as vessels to dishonour, have both received Baptism uselessly themselves, and likewise deliver it uselessly to their imitators *.

Men put on Christ, sometimes only to the Reception of the Sacrament, and sometimes also to Sanctification of Life. The first, namely the bare Reception of the Sacrament, may be common alike both to the good and to the bad: but the second, namely Sanctification of Life, is peculiar to the good and the pious alone †.

To the inclosed garden and the sealed well, Simon Magus, whom we read to have been baptised by Philip, might approach.—But, to that appropriated fountain, in which no alien communicates; to that sealed fountain, the gift of the Holy Spirit, by which

* Horum autem omnium generum, illi primi, qui sic sunt in domo Dei ut ipsi sint domus Dei, sive jam spiritales sint, sive adhuc parvuli lacte nutriantur; sed tamen ad spiritalem habitum intento corde proficiant: nemo dubitat, quin Baptismum et utiliter habeant, et se imitantibus utiliter tradant. Fictis autem, quos Spiritus Sanctus fugit, etsi ipsi, quantum in eis est, utiliter tradunt, illi tamen inutiliter accipiunt, non imitantes eos per quos accipiunt. Illi vero, qui sic sunt in magna domo tanquam vasa in contumeliam, et inutiliter habent Baptismum, et se imitantibus inutiliter tradunt. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. vii. c. 52. Oper. vol. vii. p. 74.

† Induunt autem homines Christum, aliquando usque ad sacramenti perceptionem, aliquando et ad vitæ sanctificationem: atque illud primum, et bonis et malis, potest esse commune; hoc autem alterum proprium est bonorum et piorum. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. v. c. 24. Oper. vol. vii. p. 58.

the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts; no such person approaches, unless he be changed: and he must be so universally purified, as to be no longer an alien but a citizen of the angelical city *.

6. The same right of self-explanation, which has already been granted to so many others, must not be refused to Cyril of Jerusalem.

* Ad hortum conclusum puteumque signatum potuerit accedere Simon Magus, quem legimus a Philippo baptizatum.—Ad illum tamen fontem proprium cui nemo communicat alienus, ad illum fontem signatum, hoc est, ad Spiritus Sancti donum, quo charitas Dei diffunditur in cordibus nostris, nullus istorum, nisi mutatus, accedit: ita omnino mundandus, ut non sit alienus, sed civis angelicæ civitatis. August. cont. Crescon. Grammat. lib. ii. c. 15. Oper. vol. vii. p. 156.

Though, in the judgment of Augustine, Baptism, on account of unworthy recipiency, was not always accompanied by the Gift of the Spirit or the Inward Grace of Moral Regeneration: yet, in his very sound judgment also, the Sacrament itself, as a Divine Institution, was in no wise polluted by any human unworthiness or depravity.

Non est autem aqua prophana et adultera, super quam nomen Dei invocatur, etiam si a prophanis et adulteris invocetur: quia nec ipsa creatura, nec ipsum nomen, adulterum est. Baptismus vero, Christi verbis evangelicis consecratus, et per adulteros et in adulteris sanctus est, quamvis illi sint impudici et immundi: quia ipsa ejus sanctitas pollui non potest; et sacramento suo divina virtus assistit, sive ad salutem bene utentium, sive ad perniciem malè utentium. An vero solis vel etiam lucernæ lux, cum per cœnosa diffunditur, nihil inde sordium contrahit: et Baptismus Christi potest cujusquam sceleribus inquinari? August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iii. c. 10. Oper. vol. vii. p. 42.

A sincere purpose makes thee one of the called: but, if thou bringest here thy body alone and not thy mind, thou wilt not be profited. Simon Magus approached to the Washing. He was baptised: but he was not illuminated. His body, indeed, he baptised with Water: but he illuminated not his heart with the Spirit. His body descended and ascended: but his soul was not buried along with Christ, nor was it raised again with him. These cases of falls I mention, lest thou also shouldest fall.*

If thou remainest in an evil choice, he that speaketh unto thee is blameless: but expect not thou to receive grace. The Water, indeed, will receive thee: but the Spirit will not receive thee †.

He, who is baptised with Water but who has not been deemed worthy of the Spirit, has no perfect grace: and he, who is moral and decorous in his conduct but who refuses to receive the Seal through Water, shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven‡.

* Ἡ πρόθεσις γνησία οὖσα κλητὸν σε ποιεῖ· κἂν γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ὧδε ἔχῃς, τὴν δὲ διανοίαν μὴ ἔχῃς, οὐδὲν ὠφελῇ. Προσῆλθε πότε καὶ Σίμων τῷ λουτρῷ· ὁ μάγος· ἐβαπτίσθη, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐφωτίσθη. Καὶ τὸ μὲν σῶμα ἔβαψεν ὕδατι· τὴν δὲ καρδίαν οὐκ ἐφώτισε Πνεύματι. Καὶ κατέβη μὲν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἀνέβη· ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ οὐ συνετάφη Χριστῷ, οὐδὲ συνηγέρθη. Ἔγω δὲ λέγω τὰς ὑπογραφὰς τῶν πτωμάτων, ἵνα μὴ σὺ ἐμπέσῃς. Cyril. Hieros. Proëm. in Catech. p. i. ii.

† Εἰ δὲ ἐπιμένῃς κακῇ προαιρέσει, ὁ μὲν λέγων ἀναίτιος, σὺ δὲ μὴ προσδόκα λήψεσθαι τὴν χάριν. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὕδωρ σὲ δέξεται· τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα οὐ δέξεται. Cyril. Hieros. Proëm. in Catech. p. iii.

‡ Οὐδὲ τῷ ὕδατι βαπτιζόμενος, μὴ καταξιωθεὶς δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος, τελείαν ἔχει τὴν χάριν· οὐδὲ κἂν ἐνάρετος τὶς γένηται τοῖς ἔργοις, μὴ

They, who yet remain, in the perverseness of their sins, shall be placed on the left hand, because they attained not to the grace of God which is given through Christ in the Regeneration of Baptism. I speak not of the mere Regeneration of their Bodies: I am speaking of the Spiritual Regeneration of the Soul *.

I need scarcely remark, that, in the technical language of the Early Church, Moral Regeneration was perpetually denominated *Illumination*. The phrase seems to have been borrowed from the language of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews: and we find it employed at least as early as the time of Justin Martyr, who was converted to Christianity only about thirty years after the death of St. John †.

λάβῃ δὲ τὴν δι' ὕδατος σφραγίδα, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. iii. p. 16.

* Οἷς γὰρ ἔτι τὸ τραχὺ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν περίκειται, οὗτοι ἐν τοῖς ἀριστεροῖς τυγχάνουσι, διὰ τὸ μὴ προσελθεῖν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτι, τῇ δοθείσῃ διὰ Χριστοῦ, ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ λουτροῦ ἀναγεννήσει· ἀναγέννησιν δὲ οὐ σωμάτων λέγω, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς τὴν πνευματικὴν ἀναγέννησιν. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. i. p. 2.

† Heb. vi. 4. Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν Φώτισμος, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων. Justin. Apol. i. Oper. p. 74.

Clement of Rome had virtually, though not quite verbally, used the same phraseology. The difference, indeed, is no greater, than that of Φῶς from Φώτισμος.

Τὸ Φῶς γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσατο· ὡς πατὴρ, υἱοὺς ἡμᾶς προσηγόρευσεν. Clem. Rom. Epist. ii. § 1.

II. The explanations, which have been adduced, are so perspicuous and unequivocal, that they require no comment of mine. I shall only, therefore, remark: that valuable as they all are to the sincere investigator of truth, those, afforded by Cyril of Jerusalem, have a special and peculiar value of their own.

It might be said, however unreasonably, that Justin and Tertullian and Jerome and Ambrose and Augustine were giving nothing more than their own private sentiments, which we are not therefore to deem those of the Catholic Church at large. But no such allegation can be made respecting Cyril of Jerusalem.

He was the regular Catechist of the Church of that Metropolitan City, before he himself became its Bishop or Archbishop. To the important public post which he held, he was appointed, agreeably to the Canons, by his own Ecclesiastical Superior. Hence, he was no mere unofficial speculatist: but, on the contrary, he was a strictly official functionary, to whom was committed the charge of communicating to candidates for Baptism the then universally recognised doctrine of the Church Catholic.

Such being the case, the explanations, which he gives to his Catechumens, are not merely his own private explanations, but they are the authoritative and currently received explanations of the Church herself in the fourth century.

Now, when we find, that these very explanations are but the echo of what Justin and Tertullian more briefly said in the first half and in the second half of the second century; and, again, when we find, that the same explanations are themselves also reëchoed, at a somewhat later period, or at the close of the fourth and at the beginning of the fifth century, by Jerome and Ambrose and Augustine: we cannot for a moment doubt, that they constituted the standard theology of the entire Church, both Greek and Latin, from the very beginning.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE EARLY FATHERS, TOUCHING THE POSSIBILITY OF A FUTURE RECEPTION OF MORAL REGENERATION BY THOSE, WHO, ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR INSINCERITY AND UNWORTHINESS, HAD FAILED TO RECEIVE IT THROUGH THE MEDIUM OF OUTWARD BAPTISM.

As the Early Fathers very reasonably maintained, that Baptism, when received unworthily or insincerely, failed to be the medium through which Moral Regeneration was communicated, they inevitably thence gave rise to a question of no ordinary importance.

A dissembling or profane or otherwise unworthy candidate, we will say, *had been baptised. Now it was a ruled point, that such a person, by reason of his total unfitness for the Sacrament, had not, through it, been morally regenerated. What, then, was the condition, in which he had thus placed himself? Was he capable of Moral Regeneration at*

some future time? Or, from the circumstance of his not having been morally regenerated through the mean of Baptism, was he, for ever, like the condemned spirits in hell, rendered incapable of Moral Regeneration?

According as this question was answered one way or the other, it is perfectly clear, that Baptism itself was decided to be, either the *sole* appointed mean of Moral Regeneration, or only *one* of its appointed means and thence *not* its *sole* appointed mean.

If it was determined, that the unworthy Recipient could never hereafter be morally regenerated, *because* he had failed to receive Moral Regeneration through Baptism: then Baptism was ruled to be the *sole* appointed mean, through which Moral Regeneration *could* be communicated.

But, if it was determined, that the unworthy Recipient might hereafter be morally regenerated, though, by reason of his unworthiness, he had failed to receive Moral Regeneration through Baptism: then Baptism was ruled to be *not* the *sole* appointed mean through which Moral Regeneration could be communicated; and, by consequence, it was also ruled, that there were certain *other* appointed means, as well as Baptism, through which Moral Regeneration *might* be communicated.

This last appears to be the determination of

Scripture: for Scripture, as we have seen, specifies *three* distinct means or channels.

Hence, the *presumption* is, that the same would be the determination of the Early Church.

Our present business, therefore, is, to inquire: whether, in point of *fact*, this *presumption* be well founded.

I. To such an inquiry, an answer, if I mistake not, was given at a very early period.

1. Clement of Alexandria, who flourished at the latter end of the second century, as if he were speaking nothing more than the commonly received belief of the Church, expresses himself in manner following.

A woman, who plays the harlot, is alive indeed unto sin, but is dead unto the commandments. Yet, when she has repented; inasmuch as, according to the Conversion of her life, she has been BORN AGAIN, *she possesses the* REGENERATION *of vitality. For now, in her, the former harlot is dead: and she has passed again unto life, having been* BORN *according to Repentance*.*

* Ἡ γὰρ τοι ἡ πορνεύσασα, ζῇ μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀπέθανεν δὲ ταῖς ἐντολαῖς· ἡ δὲ μετανοήσασα, οἷον ἀναγεννηθεῖσα κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν τοῦ βίου, παλιγγενεσίαν ἔχει ζωῆς· τεθνηκυίας μὲν τῆς πόρνης τῆς παλαιᾶς, εἰς βίον δὲ παρελθούσης αὖθις τῆς κατὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν γεννηθείσης. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. ii. Oper. p. 425.

I have here, according to general custom, translated Clement's μετάνοιαν by the english word *repentance*: but it may be useful to observe, that such, in point of strict ideality, is not a correct version. In this remarkable passage, Clement employs.

The woman, adduced by Clement, had evidently

as terms mutually equipollent, *Metanœa* and *Conversion* and *Regeneration* and *Death unto Sin combined with Passing into Life:* nor is such phraseological interchange without abundantly sufficient reason.

The mode, in which the very expressive Greek word *Metanœa* has been primarily translated into Latin and thence derivatively conveyed into French and Italian and Spanish and English, is most unfortunate: because, so far as ideality is concerned, it has given rise to very serious error.

By a derivation finally hellenic (for it obviously springs from ποινὴ), the latin word *Pœnitentia*, which we have anglicised into *Penitence* and *Penance* and *Repentance*, imports *Sorrow for an Offence* coupled etymologically with the idea of *Making Satisfaction or Suffering Voluntary Punishment in the way of a sort of Atonement.*

But the Greek word *Metanœa*, which, in Latin and English, we express by *Pœnitentia* and *Penitence*, as if the translation were ideally equivalent to the word translated, is nevertheless, in point of etymological ideality, altogether distinct from, and totally dissimilar to, its assumed latin and english double. It simply denotes a *Moral Change of Mind:* involving, no doubt, when such Change is a Change from Ungodliness to Godliness, the notion of *Sorrow* for the evil disposition which is the inherent characteristic of the natural man; but containing not the slightest reference to what is the predominant etymological idea of the latin word which has been employed to represent it, namely, the *Making satisfaction for Sin by the endurance of Voluntary Atoning Punishment.*

How shamefully the Popish Priesthood have abused the Latin of the Vulgate to establish, with the ignorant, their superstitious Will-Worship of Penance, is perhaps not known to every english reader.

In Matt. iii. 2, the greek Μετανοεῖτε is expressed in the Latin

been baptised: but, according to his statement of

Vulgate by *Pœnitentiam agite*. This the Rhemish translators render into English, *Do Penance:* and then gravely append to their version, *So is the Latin, word for word.*

Now it may be doubted, whether, in point of *intentional* import, the Latin expresses more than simply *Repent*, without any design of annexing to it the romish notion of *Making Satisfaction* as involved in the pretended Sacrament of Penance: but, at all events, it is a clear case, which the Rhemish commentator ought to have fairly explained to his readers, that the version *Do Penance* is any thing rather than a true exhibition of the import of the Greek. The idea, which the original word conveys, is not that of *Bodily Maceration undergone for the purpose of making Satisfaction*, but purely that of a *Moral Change of Mind and Purpose.*

With *perfect* ideal correctness, the greek *Metanœa* is incapable of being translated into any *single* word either latin or english, and thence also, I suppose, into any *single* word either french or italian or spanish. Would we, in respect to sense and etymology, *strictly* render it, we must coin a new term for the purpose. The genuine ideal translation of *Metanœa* is not *Pœnitentia* or *Penitence* or *Repentance;* and still less, in the heretical popish perversion of the term, is it *Penance:* but, agreeably to the analogy of such words as *Transfiguration* and *Transubstantiation*, it would properly, in Latin and English, be *Transmentatio* and *Transmentation.*

Now, on this principle of etymological ideality, *Metanœa* or *Transmentation* enters into the very essence and notion of *Moral Regeneration.* Hence, in order to a right and beneficial reception of Baptism, it is required, along with Faith, as the first germ of the Spiritual Life, and (in the just evolution of our Lord's metaphor) as the primary Quickening of those who were dead in trespasses and sins: and hence, in the case of unworthy Recipients of Baptism, where it does *not* attend upon

the case, falling into harlotry, she thence shewed, that she had received Baptism insincerely and therefore had never been morally regenerated. Afterward, however, she repented; or as the

the outward administration of the Mystery or Sacrament, it must, if the person would enter into the kingdom of heaven, be received *after* Baptism. Compare together Acts ii. 38. Justin. Apol. i. Oper. p. 74. Cyril. Hieros. Proëm, in Catech. p. iii.

Under such circumstances, we shall not wonder to find, that, among the Ancients, *Postbaptismal Transmentation* (inadequately expressed by the word *Pœnitentia* or *Penitence* or *Repentance*) was deemed virtually no other than *Regeneration* itself: a *Renascence of the Soul*, as Augustine somewhere terms it; a *Baptism of Tears*, as Athanasius describes it. For what is *Metanœa* or *Moral Transmentation?* We can only answer, *A Moral Change of Mind.* And what is *Moral Regeneration?* We can still only answer, pretty nearly in the same words, *A Moral Change of Disposition.*

The strict *technical* difference between them will be: that *Transmentation* is the *Incipient Spiritual Quickening of the future Child of God;* while *Regeneration* is the *Perfected Spiritual Nativity.* But, in the case of Adults who have received Baptism unworthily, and therefore ineffectually, if, through God's Grace, they be brought hereafter to a better disposition of mind and purpose, the commencement and the perfecting of that great *Moral Change*, without which they cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, so melt into each other like the colours of the rainbow, and (as Archbishop Tillotson well remarks) are so gradual in their successive development, that, to draw an exact line of *practical* distinction, the Early Church well knew to be impossible. When the blessed work was completed, the man was perceived and owned to have been *regenerated.*

greek word properly means, experienced a *Moral Transmentation:* and, according to this *Conversion* of her life, she was, in all the purposes and actings of her soul, *born again.* Now such *Spiritual Conversion* or *Moral Transmentation,* occurring at some indefinite time after her ineffectual Baptism, constituted, what Clement, with the Early Church, hesitated not to denominate *Regeneration.*

2. We find the same doctrine faithfully handed down to later ages: and, under the cognate names of *Illumination* and *Conversion* and *Initiative Perfection* and *Penitential Baptism* (for all these terms are of the same import, alike denoting a *Moral Change of Disposition*), the possibility and necessity of a *Postbaptismal Regeneration,* when through unworthiness Regeneration had *not* been received in Baptism, is harmoniously insisted upon by those four great Fathers of the Eastern and Western Churches, Athanasius and Ambrose and Jerome and Augustine.

(1.) Let us first hear the statement of Athanasius.

To the nature of man, God hath given three Baptisms, which are capable of purifying from every sin: the Baptism through Water; the Baptism through a Person's own Blood in Martyrdom; and the Baptism through Tears.—Know, then, that, in like manner as the Fountain of Baptism, so, moreover, the Fountain of Tears, purifieth a man.*

* Τριά βαπτίσματα, καθάρτικα πάσης οἵας δήποτε ἁμαρτίας, ὁ

(2.) Next, we may attend to the closely parallel language of Ambrose.

*Mortify the flesh, and sprinkle over it the Contrition of the Heart: then, over all its evil propensities, send the Water of Jordan. For, of Jordan, there is a descent and an ascent: inasmuch as he, who shall have descended into the sacred Fountain, ascends also in order that he may seek those things which are above; because he, who is baptised in Christ and ascends to his resurrection, first descends to the death of Christ. But, if, being already baptised, thou hast erred, send over thy sin the Water of Tears, not mendacious, but true.—Thou hast sent, then, the Water of Jordan, the Water of Grace: drink this first. Thou hast also sent the Water of Tears, the Water of Penitence: this is the second cup, that thou mayest repair the first. —If Tears be bread, thou hast, from the very sinfulness of thine iniquity, the food of Conversion.— We often see persons, who had previously been negligent Christians, become more diligent after the commission of some sin; and thus, out of that sin, through Penitence, not unfrequently become Perfect *.*

Θεὸς τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐδωρήσατο· λέγω δὲ, τὸ ὕδατος, καὶ πάλιν τὸ διὰ μαρτυρίας τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, καὶ τρίτον τὸ διὰ δακρύων,— Δεῖ γὰρ εἰδέναι, ὅτι, ὁμοίως τοῦ βαπτίσματος, ἡ τῶν δακρύων πηγὴ καθαρίξει τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Athan. Quæst. ad Antioch. quæst. lxxii. Oper. vol. ii. p. 296.

* Contere, igitur, has carnes; et, super eas, contritionem tui

(3.) Let us next hear the analogous language of Jerome.

Under the Law, he, who was cutting wood, if the head of his ax should accidentally fly off and kill a man, was commanded, to go to the city of refuge, and there to remain until a High-Priest should rise up. That is, let a person be redeemed with the blood of the Saviour, either in the House of Baptism, or in Penitence which imitates the Grace of Baptism: a privilege granted through the ineffable clemency of the Saviour, who willeth not that any should perish, who delights not in the death of sinners, but who rather delights that they should be converted and live *.

cordis adsperge: deinde mitte, super omnia ea, Jordanis aquam. Jordanis, enim, descensio et adscensio est: quoniam, qui in fontem sacrum descenderit; et adscendit, ut, quæ superiora sunt, quærat. Descendit enim in mortem Christi, qui baptizatur in Christo et in resurrectionem ejus adscendit. Si autem, jam baptizatus, errasti, mitte aquam lachrymarum, non mendacem, sed veram.—Misisti ergo aquam Jordanis, aquam gratiæ: hoc primum bibe. Misisti aquam lachrymarum, aquam pœnitentiæ: hoc secundum est poculum, ut primum repares.—Si lachrymæ panes, habes, ex peccato iniquitatis, cibum *Conversionis*.—Unde scepe videmus aliquos, qui ante negligentes fuerant Christiani, peccato aliquo commisso, fieri diligentiores, et ex illo, per pœnitentiam, evadere solere *Perfectos*. Ambros. Enarr. in Psalm. xxxvii. § 10, 11. Oper. vol. i. col. 819, 820.

* Qui ligna cædit, si, securi ac ferro fugiente de ligno, homo fuerit occisus, pergere jubetur ad urbem fugitivorum, et tam diu ibi esse quam diu Sacerdos Maximus oriatur. Id est,

(4.) Lastly, we may hear the statement of Augustine.

We ought not to despair of the Conversion of any one, whether without or within the pale of the Church, so long as the patience of God leads him to Penitence, visiting with a rod his sins and with a scourge his offences. In this manner, he removes not his mercy from them, if, pleasing God, they shall at length have mercy on their own souls.— Many men, even within the pale of the Church, are baptised while yet they are carnal and natural. For the Apostle openly declares, that The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: *so that he still calls them* natural, *even after they have received Baptism. Except, however, from God, the soul, which is given up to the corporeal senses, cannot but have its savour according to carnal sense. Whence, many persons, who make a proficiency after Baptism, and most especially those who have been baptised when infants or children, by how much the more their intellect is illuminated while the inner man is renewed from day to day, reject, with detestation and confession of their error, the former opinions which they held concerning God when they were mocked by their own vain imaginations.—*

redimatur sanguine Salvatoris, aut in domo Baptismatis, aut in Pœnitentia quæ imitatur Baptismatis Gratiam, per ineffabilem clementiam Salvatoris, qui non vult perire quemquam, nec delectatur mortibus peccatorum, sed ut *convertantur* et vivant. Hieron. adv. Pelagian. lib. i. c. 10. Oper. vol. ii. p. 232.

He, who has not charity, must be baptised that he may have it: but he, who has it not usefully, must be corrected that he may have it usefully.—If, then, we be the Lord's true wheat, it is very possible for us, even within the Church, to be associated with the avaritious, the rapacious, the drunken, and other similar pests; respecting whom it is said, They shall not possess the kingdom: *while yet the Sacrament of Baptism is common to all alike, though the vices, which exclude the evil from the kingdom of God, are not thus common* *.

* De *Conversione* autem nullius desperandum est, sive foris sive intus constituti, quamdiu patientia Dei ad Pœnitentiam eum adducit, et visitat in virga facinora eorum et in flagellis peccata eorum. Hoc enim modo, misericordiam suam non dispergit ab eis, si et ipsi aliquando misereantur animæ suæ, placentes Deo.—Multi carnales et animales etiam intus baptizantur: cum apertè dicat Apostolus, *Animalis autem homo non percipit ea, quæ sunt Spiritus Dei;* et, percepto jam Baptismo, dicit eos adhuc *animales* esse. Secundum sensum autem carnalem, non potest, nisi de Deo, carnaliter sapere anima, corporeis sensibus dedita. Unde multi, post Baptismum proficiences, et maximè qui infantes vel pueri baptizati sunt, quanto magis intellectus eorum serenatur et *illuminatur*, dum interior homo renovatur de die in diem, priores suas opiniones, quas de Deo habebant cum in suis phantasmatibus ludificarentur, et detestantes atque confitentes abjiciunt.—Qui non habet (charitatem,) est baptizandus, ut habeat: qui autem non utiliter habet, ut utiliter habeat, corrigendus.—Potest nobis, si frumenta dominica sumus, etiam intus, cum avaris, cum raptoribus, cum ebriosis, et cæteris ejusmodi pestibus, de quibus dicitur *Regnum Dei non possidebunt*, et Baptismatis Sacramentum esse commune, et tamen vitia, quibus a regno Dei separantur, non

3. When Clement spoke of the postbaptismal Regeneration of a converted harlot, he did nothing more than maintain the doctrine of a yet prior age, of an age, in truth, no other than even apostolic itself.

Flourishing in the latter half of the second century, this Father attests: that, in his days, there were sundry persons still alive, who had immediately conversed with the holy Apostles, Peter and James and John and Paul, and who had faithfully preserved and communicated, to the Theologians of his time and succession, the true tradition of the blessed doctrine of the Gospel *.

From some one of these, who probably had it

esse communia. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 14, 15, 17. Oper. vol. vii. p. 50, 51.

There can be no mistake as to the import of the term *Conversion*, here employed by Augustine. Shortly afterward, in the course of the same Treatise, he tells us: that Baptism is its Mystery or Sacrament or Outward Sign. Whence, inevitably, he makes it identical with *Regeneration*.

In baptizatis infantibus, præcedit *Regenerationis* Sacramentum: et, si christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequitur etiam in corde *Conversio*, cujus Mysterium præcessit in corpore. Ibid. c. 24. p. 52.

* Ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν τὴν ἀληθῆ τῆς μακαρίας σώζοντες διδασκαλίας παράδοσιν, εὐθὺς ἀπὸ Πέτρου τε καὶ Ἰακώβου, Ἰωάννου τε καὶ Παύλου, τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων, παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκδεχόμενος (ὀλίγοι δὲ οἱ πατράσιν ὅμοιοι), ἦκον δὴ, σὺν Θεῷ, καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς, τὰ πρωτογόνικα ἐκεῖνα καὶ ἀποστόλικα καταθησόμενοι σπέρματα. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. i. Oper. p. 274, 275.

from St. John, he received, of course when he was himself a young man, a very remarkable story: no *concocted fable* or mere *ecclesiastical romance*, as he expressly states, but a *literally true narrative*, which had been handed down to him, and which he had carefully treasured up in his memory *.

The story was this.

St. John, in the discharge of his metropolitan duties which extended specially over the Lesser Asia, had occasion to go to a city not far from Ephesus. Here he became acquainted with a youth, whose outward bearing and seemingly good disposition greatly interested him. His stay, however, could not be prolonged. Whereupon, at his departure, turning to the individual whom he had appointed Bishop of that city, he solemnly, in the attesting presence of Christ and his Church, committed to his spiritual charge the young man whom he had deemed so promising a subject. The Bishop accepted the charge: and, after conducting him through the regular course of catechetical instruction, finally, believing him to be sincere and devout, admitted him to the Sacrament of Baptism. After this, on the ground that the supposed neophyte was sufficiently defended

* Ἄκουσον μῦθον, οὐ μῦθον, ἀλλὰ ὄντα λόγον, περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, παραδεδόμενον, καὶ μνήμῃ πεφυλάγμένον. **Clem. Alex.** Quis dives salvabitur? apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. iii. c. 23.

by the Baptismal Seal of the Lord, the episcopal superintendence was slackened *. But the judgment proved erroneous. The youth, left to the devices of his own evil heart, followed the natural, though hitherto unsuspected, bent of his inclination: and thence speedily joined himself to a troop of idle and dissolute and thoroughly profligate individuals, his equals in point of age. For a season, they indulged only in expensive and riotous living: but, at length, they organised themselves into a regular gang of marauding banditti. The charitably supposed, and indisputably baptised, convert exceeded them all in violence, bloodshed, and ferocity: whence, by acclamation, he was chosen to be their captain †. Thus, from bad to worse, matters went on for a season. In course of time, business again brought St. John to the same city: and, on his arrival, one of his first inquiries respected the promising youth, in whom he had felt so deep an interest. *Bishop*, said he, *pay me back the loan, which, with the Church for our witness, Christ and I intrusted to you.* The Bishop, not understanding him, thought that through calumny he was thus called upon to refund a sum

* Μετὰ τοῦτο, ὑφῆκε τῆς πλείονος ἐπιμελείας καὶ παραφυλακῆς, ὡς τὸ τέλειον αὐτῷ φυλακτήριον ἐπιστήσας τὴν σφραγῖδα τοῦ Κυρίου. **Clem. Alex. ut supra.**

† Αὐτοὺς δὴ τούτους ἀναλαβὼν, καὶ ληστήριον συγκροτήσας, ἕτοιμος λῃσταρχος ἦν· βιαιότατος, μιαιφονώτατος, χαλεπώτατος. Clem. **Alex. ut supra.**

of money, which he had never borrowed: but the Apostle soon undeceived him. *I redemand at your hand*, said he, *the soul of the youth whom I intrusted to your pastoral care.* On this, groaning and weeping, *Alas*, replied the Bishop, *he is dead.* St. John promptly inquired, how, and when, and by what death. *To God he is dead*, rejoined the Bishop: *for he has fallen away to all evil courses; until, at length, becoming a robber, he has, instead of taking Christ's Church for his portion, occupied, with his abandoned associates, a mountainous wild fit for their lawless purposes.* Forthwith, at these lamentable tidings, after rebuking the Bishop for his negligence, the holy and aged Apostle rent his garments and beat his head: then, having demanded and procured a horse and a guide, he took, without hesitation, the direct road to the formidable haunt of the robbers. Reaching their outposts, *Lead me*, cried he, *to your captain: for I am come specially to see him.* The commander of the banditti, little at first suspecting the character of his visitor, received him armed as he was: but, as soon as he perceived the well-remembered countenance of the venerable man, he precipitately betook himself to flight. *My son*, cried his eager pursuer regardless of his own age and infirmities, *why fleest thou from thy old and unarmed father? Fear not: there is still, in Christ, a hope of thy salvation.* At these oft-repeated exclamations, the robber-chief first stop-

ped with his eyes fixed to the ground: then, throwing down his arms, he burst into a flood of tears, wherewithal he was baptised as with a second Baptism *. *Upon this*, so the narrative concludes, *the Apostle led him back to the Church: and, offering up abundance of prayers, and wrestling with him in prolonged fastings, and soothing him with words of hope and consolation, he desisted not until he had restored him to the Church; thus effecting a mighty example of true Change of Mind and a signal indication of* REGENERATION, *even a trophy of such a Resurrection from the spiritually dead as all men might openly behold* †.

On the exquisite beauty of this story, which Eusebius has happily transcribed from a now lost Work of Clement, it is superfluous, perhaps also as concerns my present purpose irrelevant, to descant.

It is here adduced, simply in evidence: and it goes to prove, that, in the judgment of the Earliest Church, sanctioned apparently by the voice of an Apostle, and at all events in full harmony with that Apostle's own written record, an unworthy

* Τοῖς δάκρυσι βαπτιζόμενος ἐκ δευτέρου. **Clem. Alex. ut supra.**

† Ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ἐπανήγαγε· καὶ δαψίλεσι μὲν εὐχαῖς ἐξαιτούμενος, σύνέχεσι δὲ νηστείαις συναγωνιζόμενος, ποικίλαις δὲ ῥήσεσι λόγων κατεπᾴδων αὐτοῦ τὴν γνώμην, οὐ πρότερον ἀπῆλθεν, ὡς φάσι, πρὶν αὐτὸν ἀποκατέστησε τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ· διδοὺς μέγα παράδειγμα ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΣ ἀληθινῆς, καὶ μέγα γνώρισμα ΠΑΛΙΓΓΕΝΕΣΙΑΣ, τρόπαιον ἀναστάσεως βλεπομένης. **Clem. Alex. ut supra.**

Recipient of Baptism might hereafter, if truly penitent, obtain, either through the mean of *God's Revealed Word* forcibly brought home to his soul, or through the mean of a *Devout and Believing Reception of Christ the Saviour*, that Moral Regeneration, which, in his previous Outward Baptism, he had, by reason of his unworthiness or spiritual inaptitude, failed to obtain *.

The Conversion of the young man, so Clement received and recorded the statement, was a signal indication of REGENERATION; even a trophy of such a Resurrection from *the spiritually dead* (the precise description of man in his natural or unregenerate state) as all might behold and admire †.

Here we have no ambiguity. The *Moral Change of Mind*, the *Metanœa*, the *Transmentation*, produced by the successful application of God's Word and the powerful exhibition of Christ the Saviour, is explicitly declared to be, not a mere Restoration to the beneficial enjoyment of an *already* communicated privilege, but actually and absolutely and unreservedly the Grace of REGENERATION itself: and the declaration, moreover, runs with such a complete appearance of unpremeditated familiarity, that we cannot equitably doubt its propounding the universally received and ac-

* John i. 12, 13. 1 John i. 8, 9. ii. 8, 9, 29. iv. 7—11. v. 1—5. See above, book ii. chap. 3. § III.

† See Ephes. ii. 1—5. Coloss. ii. 13. Heb. vi. 1. ix. 14. 1 Peter iv. 6. Jude 12. Rev. iii. 1.

credited doctrine of the Primitive Church, as a matter too notorious to require either apology or softening or explanation *.

The youth, after he had been so remarkably induced to quit the life of a robber and an outlaw, is unreservedly declared, through St. John's prayers and effectual predication of God's Word, to have been REGENERATED.

Consistently with this declaration, as he is said, by the Bishop who baptised him, to have been, nevertheless, *spiritually dead to God and the*

* Bishop Bethell and Mr. Harcourt agree in attempting to break the force of this testimony, on the plea, that Eusebius employs only a figurative style, or that the Conversion of the young man is only figuratively denominated *Regeneration*. See Bethell's Doctrine of Regen. chap. i. p. 7. note. Harcourt's Doctrine of the Deluge. chap. xxviii. vol. ii. p. 583.

With all respect, I cannot but think such handling of testimony not a little dangerous. If evidence is thus to be set aside, I see not what we can depend upon.

I may add, that, in the language at least of the Bishop, there is some little degree of inaccuracy. He speaks of the figurative style of *Eusebius*. Now, let the style be what it may, it is not the style of *that* writer. It is the style of one, who flourished long before Eusebius: the style, to wit, either of Clement himself, or rather apparently of the yet more ancient individual who communicated the anecdote to Clement. That Father's account of the anecdote is; Λόγον, περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, παραδεδόμενον, καὶ μνήμῃ πεφυλάγμενον: and, by his use of the expression ὡς φασι, he seems pretty plainly to indicate, that the term *Regeneration* was the term employed by those aged scholars of the Apostles from whom he had received the narrative.

Church: so, upon his subsequent REGENERATION, he is said to have afforded a trophy of such a *Resurrection from a State of Spiritual Death*, as all men might clearly and palpably behold *.

But, yet further, we are assured: that, upon making a fair outward profession, he had, anterior to his entering upon a course of sensual profligacy and lawless violence, been regularly admitted to the Sacrament of Baptism.

Now, from all these several recorded facts, we can, I think, legitimately draw but one inference.

The youth had received Baptism, dissemblingly, secularly, impenitently, unworthily: or else perhaps he had received it under the influence of merely excited animal feelings, like those of the hearers compared in the Parable to stony places with no deepness of earth. Therefore, along with the Outward Sign, he had *not* received the Inward Grace of Moral Regeneration. Hence, he remained *dead:* though, for a season, to fallible man who cannot read the heart, he might *seem* to be *alive.* But, nevertheless, he became a signal trophy of God's wonderful mercy. After an interval of several years spent in rapine and bloodshed and debauchery, he was brought, through the mean of God's Word powerfully

* It is of some importance to observe, that the language here used is evidently borrowed from that of the apostle touching the Inward Grace of which Baptism is the Outward Sign. See Rom. vi. 2—5. Coloss. ii. 12, 13. iii. 1.

preached to him by an Apostle, to a lively and penitent sense of his true condition: and thus, in the judgment of the Primitive Church, as guided apparently by the judgment of St. John, he exhibited, in his own person, a mighty indication of REGENERATION, successive to an unworthy and therefore morally ineffectual reception of Outward Baptism. In all its points, so far as I can perceive, the proof is complete *.

* Valesius, under the influence, I suppose, of the opinion that *Regeneration and Baptism are so far inseparable that the former is never communicated save through the channel of the latter,* has thought fit in the way perhaps of a *Lege cautè*, to put down, in his latin version of the place, the TWO words *iteratæ regenerationis.*

Here, however, the word *iteratæ* is a mere gratuitous interpolation of the translator: for, in the original Greek, Clement employs only the SINGLE word παλιγγενεσίας.

The interpolation, I apprehend, is alike gratuitous and unskilful.

By thus forcing the ancient Father to speak of an *iterated* or *second* Regeneration, he virtually puts into his mouth a Scheme of False Theology based upon a palpably False Metaphor, which the Catholic Church has never recognised. As there can be no more than *one* natural birth: so, by the very force and propriety of the Metaphor adopted by our Lord, there can be no more than *one* spiritual birth. The naturally born man may fall into severe bodily sickness: and recover. And the spiritually born man may, analogously, fall into severe spiritual sickness: and, through God's mercy, may be restored to spiritual health. But, since they have alike commenced, the one his physical life, the other his spiritual life: it is alike impossible, being in fact a contradiction in terms, that either should

II. During the primitive ages, we do not, in express terms, very frequently hear of a Moral Regeneration *subsequently* communicated to unworthy Recipients of Baptism: but the reason of this, I think, is sufficiently obvious.

Upon the case of any one, who has duly and with apparent seriousness received the Mystery of Outward Baptism, it is dangerous for fallible man to pronounce positively. *Judge not, that ye be not judged,* is a divine precept, which is here of especial application. God only, or an inspired servant of God, can know with unerring certainty: whether a *now* manifest sinner, or a clearly *now* irreligious person, was morally regenerated through Baptism, and afterward fell away with a capability of being *only restored* through contrition and amendment of life; or whether, by reason of his original unworthiness and inaptitude, his Outward Baptism *altogether failed* of being accompanied by Inward Moral Regeneration.

This fear of *personally* pronouncing rash judgment would naturally lead to what may be called

now for the first time commence, what already he had previously commenced. As Athanasius well observes, it is a ruled case: that *There is only one Renovation through Baptism, and not a second.* Μίαν εἶναι τὴν Ἀνακαίνισιν διὰ τοῦ Βαπτίσματος, καὶ μὴ δευτέραν. Athan. in illud Evan. Quicunque dixerit. Oper. vol. i. p. 767. If the young man had been *already* regenerated through Baptism, on the principle that Baptism is the *sole* channel of Regeneration, he could not have experienced what Valesius is pleased to call *Iterata Regeneratio.*

the milder construction in the *particular* case of any directly specified individual: though, *abstractedly* and *generally*, the doctrine of the Primitive Church would itself, in theory, remain unaltered. Yet even particular cases, such as that of the robber-captain, would occasionally occur, in which it would be found rationally impossible to designate a palpable Moral Change of Mind, from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, by any name inferior to the very term REGENERATION itself.

1. Such, I take it, was the principle, on which the Early Church dealt with the lapsed.

These unhappy offenders, whether their lapse consisted in a declension to scandalous profligacy or in an apostasy from the faith during a season of persecution, when brought to a better state of mind, expressed their deep contrition for sin united with an earnest purpose of amendment. They had been baptised: but they had disgraced their Baptism. Under what light, then, were they to be considered? Had they never been regenerated? Or were they regenerated persons, who had fallen away from their Regeneration?

In the judgment of charity, the Church, conscious that no human being can certainly read the heart of another, wished rather to view them, as having fallen away from their Regeneration, than as having never, by reason of deliberate impenitence or hypocrisy, been at all regenerated.

An inspired Apostle might confidently and unerringly decide respecting baptised apostates: *They went out from us, but they were not of us; for, if they had been of us, they would have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest, that they were not all of us* *. But the uninspired Church, save in some very notorious cases of manifestation, would naturally be unwilling to declare positively, that certain of her lapsed outward members had *never* been morally regenerated, or, as the Apostle speaks, that they were *not* of us the Elect and Renovated Society of Christians.

On this charitable hypothesis, the whole business of Penitence was conducted †. But still, as we have seen, its language was such as to imply: that under the name of *Matanœa* or

* 1 John ii. 19.

† Penitence was charitably viewed, as a restoration to a state once possessed but unhappily relinquished. In gratiam nos Domino *revocat*. Tertull. de Pœnit. § 5. Oper. p. 480. The doctrine was sometimes abused to a slovenly deferring of Penitence, on the ground of the security afforded by an already received Baptism. This lamentable error is justly castigated by Tertullian. Omne præterea cunctationis et tergiversationis, erga Pœnitentiam, vitium, præsumptio Intinctionis importat. Certi enim indubitatæ veniæ delictorum, medium tempus interim furantur, et commeatum sibi faciunt delinquendi, quam eruditionem non delinquendi. Ibid. § 6. p. 481. Clearly, such individuals acted upon the presumption, that, since they had already been regenerated, they might safely take their time in regard to Repentance.

Transmentation, nothing less than a real and proper Regeneration *might* peradventure be the actual amount of the Saving Change experienced by the Penitents *.

2. In propounding to the lapsed the necessity of this verbally disguised Regeneration, the Church has copied the example of St. Paul in his mode of treating the Galatians.

My little children, of whom I AGAIN *travail in birth, until* CHRIST SHALL HAVE BEEN FORMED IN YOU ; *I desire to be present with you now and to change my voice : for I stand* IN DOUBT *of you* †.

The Apostle, we must observe, had already ONCE travailed in birth of the Galatians, when, by a faithful preaching of Repentance and Conversion through Christ crucified, he was preparing them for a due and beneficial reception of Baptism. *Ye know,* says he, *how, through infirmity of the flesh, I preached the Gospel unto you* AT THE FIRST ‡. But, in the case of some at least, he

* Tertullian seems to adopt the same studied ambiguity, when, in his Treatise on Penitence, he speaks of the Baptism of Penitence: Intinctionem Pœnitentiæ. Tertull. de Pœnit. § 2. Oper. p. 477. The expression, in itself, may mean, either ordinary Baptism (Acts ii. 38.), or what Athanasius calls a secondary Baptism by the Tears of Repentance or Transmentation. When such an expression was used, the *general* question, *Whether penitents had or had not been morally regenerated through Baptism,* was left open.

† Galat. iv. 19, 20. ‡ Galat. iv. 13.

feared that his *original* labour had been ineffectual. *I stand*, said he, IN DOUBT *of you*.

What, then, under such circumstances, remained to be done?

St. Paul informs us: that, by yet a *second* attempt to bring them to a practical reception of the sincere Gospel, he is AGAIN travailing in birth of them, until CHRIST SHALL HAVE BEEN FORMED IN THEM.

His *first* attempt had been unsuccessful: for, in some of them, he greatly doubted, whether Christ *had* been formed. He determines, therefore, to make a *second* attempt: and this, through God's blessing, he trusts may be more successful. *I* AGAIN *travail in birth of you*, UNTIL *Christ shall have been formed in you*. The word UNTIL expresses his fear, that no such Internal Formation of Christ had *as yet* taken place: and the word AGAIN expresses his determination to renew his labour, in order that, what hitherto had *not been* effected, *might* at length *be* effected.

Meanwhile, he solemnly declares: that, *in Christ Jesus, neither Circumcision availeth any thing, nor Uncircumcision, but* A NEW CREATION *. And this NEW CREATION he presses upon them: inasmuch as, without *it*, every thing else would be vain and unprofitable.

Thus theologises St. Paul to the Galatians: and how are we to understand his language?

* Galat. vi. 15.

The SPIRITUAL FORMATION OF CHRIST IN A PERSON, as the Church always interpreted the phrase, is a synonyme of *Regeneration* or *Renovation* or *Conversion* or (as the Apostle speaks) *New Creation*.

Hence, when the Sacrament of Baptism had been, as the Church might charitably hope, worthily and therefore effectually received, the now initiated and regenerated *Mystæ* (as baptised Catechumens were wont to be called) were thenceforward denominated *Christophori* or *Christ-Bearers:* inasmuch as they bore *Christ formed within them*. This we learn from Cyril of Jerusalem, in the fourth century*. But the phraseology itself was, in that age, by no means modern

* Τότε ὑμῶν ἑκάστου παραδείσου θύρα ἀνεωχθῇ. Τότε ὑδάτων ἀπολαύσητε, Χριστοφόρων ἐχόντων εὐωδίαν. Τότε Χριστοῦ προσηγορίαν λάβητε, καὶ ἐνέργειαν θείων πραγμάτων. Cyril. Hieros. Proëm. in Catech. p. vii. viii.

Upon the title *Christophorus*, the Romish Mythologists have strangely built the monstrous figment of a gigantic St. Christopher, who on his shoulders bore the infant Christ over a river which could not be forded by mortals of ordinary stature. I am not sufficient antiquary to fix the age of this fable: but it does not occur in either of the *Gospels of Christ's Infancy*. A print of the holy giant thus bearing the Saviour, while the water only reaches up to his knees, I remember once to have encountered. Christopher afterward suffered martyrdom, declining, I suppose, to put forth his gigantic strength in self-defence. Thus having obtained a place in the Romish Martyrology, he was duly supplicated, to make his votaries worthy of the honour of the Deity, to confer upon them consolation, to

or new-fangled: on the contrary, it runs back even to apostolic times. Thus Ignatius, the disciple of St. John, constantly, in his Epistles, styles himself *Theophorus* or *God-Bearer:* and, when questioned by Trajan what such an extraordinary title imported, he promptly replied, agreeably to the Catholic Faith which teaches the Essential Divinity of our Saviour, that *A Theophorus is one who has Christ in his breast internally* *.

Such being the case, since the idea of a *second* Regeneration has never for a moment been tolerated, St. Paul, in *again* travailing that Christ might be formed in the Galatians, insinuated his doubt and fear, that, although baptised, some of them had never been morally regenerated. Baptism, however, was not, in these circumstances,

take away the bitterness of death, and to give them a good delivery in the day of judgment.

> Martyr Christophore, pro Salvatoris honore,
> Fac nos mente fore dignos Deitatis honore.
> Promisso Christi, quia quod petis obtinuisti,
> Da populo tristi dona quæ moriendo petisti.
> Confer solamen, et mortis tolle gravamen.
> Judicis examen fac mite sit omnibus. Amen.

Such is Popery, or, as its adherents would fain persuade us to call it, Catholicism! *These be thy gods, O Israel, which, brought thee up out of the land of Egypt!*

* Τραϊανὸς εἶπεν· Καὶ τὶς ἐστιν Θεόφορος; Ἰγνάτιος ἀπεκρίνατο· Ὁ Χριστὸν ἔχων ἐν στέρνοις. Martyr. S. Ignat. § II.

to be repeated: for, in the technicality of ecclesiastical language, *there was but one Renovation through Baptism, and not a second.* Assuming, therefore, in the judgment of charity, that the baptised were also regenerated, the Church, when dealing with *particular* persons, was unwilling, save in some very strongly marked cases, to say; that *A baptised individual, who had failed to receive Moral Regeneration through Baptism, might subsequently be regenerated:* because such a declaration would plainly involve the idea, and would thence amount to a charge; that *Baptism, by such or such particular person, had been profanely and unworthily received.*

I think, we may trace some such principle as this in the ancient comments upon St. Paul's language to the Galatians, more especially those of Jerome and Athanasius*. The necessity of

* At nunc omnes judices sumus!—Non ad nos pertinet, ut Christus formetur in populo, ut ad domum suam unusquisque rediens habeat semen verbi Dei!—Formatur quoque Christus in corde credentium, cum omnia illis sacramenta panduntur, et ea, quæ obscurè videbantur, perspicua fiunt. Sed et illud est intuendum, quod, qui per peccatum quodammodo homo esse desierat, per pœnitentiam concipitur a magistro, et rursum in eo Christi formatio repromittitur. Hoc adversum Novatianos, qui nolunt reformari eos quos semel peccata contriverint. Hieron. Comment. in loc. Oper. vol. vi. p. 142.

Τοὺς δὲ Γαλάτας πάλιν δρομήσαντας ὠδινει, ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ πάλιν Χριστὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς. Ἐν δὲ τῷ λέγειν ΠΑΛΙΝ, δείκνυσιν αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν προτέραν ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τελειότητα. Τὶ δὲ καὶ Νοβάτῳ μεμφόμεθα,

a Moral Change was evident: but the old Ecclesiastics chose rather to disguise it under the

ἀναιροῦντι τὴν μετανοίαν, καὶ φάσκοντι μηδεμίαν συγγνώμην ἔχειν τοὺς μετὰ τὸ λουτρὸν ἁμαρτάνοντας, εἰ, διὰ τοὺς μετὰ τὸ λουτρὸν ἁμαρτάνοντας, εἴρηται τὸ ῥητὸν; Καὶ γὰρ τὸ, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους, ῥητὸν εἰρημενὸν, οὐκ ἐκκλεῖον. Ἐστι γὰρ τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων τὴν μετανοίαν· ἀλλὰ δεικνύον, ἓν εἶναι τὸ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας βάπτισμα, καὶ μὴ δεύτερον. Ἑβραίοις γὰρ ἔγραφε· καὶ ἵνα μὴ νομίσωσι, κατὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ συνήθειαν, προφάσει μετανοίας, εἶναι πολλὰ καθ' ἡμέτεραν βαπτίσματα, διὰ τοῦτο, μετανοεῖν μὲν παραινεῖ· μίαν δὲ εἶναι τὴν ἀνακαίνισιν διὰ τοῦ βάπτίσματος, καὶ μὴ δευτέραν, ἀποφαίνεται· ὡς γὰρ ἐν ἑτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ φησὶ, Μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα. Οὐ δὲ γὰρ εἶπεν, ἀδύνατον μετανοεῖν· ἀλλ' οὐ δύνατον, προφάσει μετανοίας, ἀνακαινίζειν ἡμᾶς τίνας. Ἔχει δὲ πολλὴν τὴν διαφοράν. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ μετανοῶν, παύεται μὲν τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν· ἔχει δὲ τῶν τραυμάτων τάς οὐλάς. Ὁ δὲ βαπτιζόμενος, τὸν μὲν παλαιὸν ἀπεκδύσκεται· ἀνακαινίζεται δὲ, ὡς ἄνωθεν γεννηθεὶς, τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτι. Athan. in illud Evan. Quicunque dixerit. Oper. vol. i. p. 767.

Athanasius, I suppose, means to intimate: that, where a person has been morally regenerated through Baptism and has afterward fallen away, should he at length be recovered through Repentance, we must not distinguish his Repentance by the name of *Regeneration*, inasmuch as there can only be *one* Regeneration or Renovation or Birth from above: for Athanasius, according to the wont of the early writers, employs these several terms as synonymous.

It is worthy of observation, that both he and Jerome misplace St. Paul's *again*, as it occurs in Galat. iv. The Apostle, with strict theological correctness, speaks of his *again* travailing in birth of the Galatians, until Christ should have been formed in them: but his two commentators, with singular theological incorrectness, exhibit him, as speaking of his travailing in birth of the Galatians, until Christ should *again*

name of *Conversion* or *Transmentation*, than, in all cases, openly and avowedly to call it *Regeneration.*

Meanwhile, the doctrine itself, *abstractedly* and so far as *generals* were concerned, remained unaltered. As plain common sense itself requires, it was, as we have seen, again and again acknowledged: that Baptism acts not mechanically or *ex opere operato;* so that every baptised person, under that *precise* aspect and in that *precise* character, was, assuredly, a regenerated person also. On the contrary, it was distinctly ruled: that, in all cases of profane or impenitent or hypocritical or (in a single word) unworthy reception, Moral Regeneration was *not* communicated through the medium of Outward Baptism. Hence, on the hypothesis of any *particular* person having been an unworthy Recipient, the alternative, inevitably presented itself: either that such person might, upon his sincere Repentance, be *hereafter* regenerated through some other mean than Baptism; or else that, having failed to

have been formed in them. That is to say, St. Paul expresses a doubt, whether Christ had *ever* been formed in them or whether they had *ever* been regenerated, notwithstanding their Baptism: but his commentators make him incongruously travail in birth of them, until Christ shall *again* have been formed in them, or until they shall *again* have been regenerated.

The Apostle's precise words are these.

Τεκνία μου, οὓς ΠΑΛΙΝ ὠδίνω, ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν.

acquire Moral Regeneration through Baptism, he became hereafter *for ever* incapable of its acquisition. The Church, wisely and (I think) scripturally, adopted the first part of the alternative: but, though the principle was *general*, she was unwilling, save in very marked cases, to incur the responsibility of its direct and avowed application to *particulars*.

CHAPTER IX.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE EARLY FATHERS, TOUCHING THE POSSIBILITY OF A RECEPTION OF MORAL REGENERATION, EITHER BEFORE BAPTISM, OR IN SOME CASES WITHOUT BAPTISM.

By determining, that *Moral Regeneration does not accompany Outward Baptism when Outward Baptism is received unworthily ;* and by also determining, that *Those unworthy Recipients of Outward Baptism, who have failed to acquire Moral Regeneration through that medium, may afterward acquire it by Conversion and Repentance,* which, in their case, are indeed no other than Moral Regeneration itself : the Church, agreeably to her possession of *authority in Controversies of Faith,* has determined ; that *Moral Regeneration may be communicated after Baptism,* and thence that *Moral Regeneration may be communicated through a medium different from and distinct from Outward Baptism.*

In this decision, she fully agrees with Scripture, inasmuch as she has deduced from Scripture a perfectly legitimate conclusion. For Scripture, evidently providing for such and other similar cases, and reserving to God the full and unrestricted sovereignty of mercy, has not inseparably tied Moral Regeneration to the reception of Outward Baptism; but has declared, that there are three several means or channels, through which, to fallen man, God communicates the grace of Moral Regeneration: *Outward Baptism itself*, to wit; and *A Believing Reception of Christ;* and *The Living Word of Truth set forth in the Gospel* *.

If, then, Moral Regeneration may be communicated *after* Baptism, where, by unworthy reception of the Outward Sign, it has failed of being communicated *through* Baptism; we certainly, even *a fortiori*, may conclude from Scripture, that, in some cases, it may be communicated both *before* Baptism and *without* Baptism.

These two matters, the BEFORE and the WITHOUT, stand closely and immediately connected together.

For, if a person may be regenerated *before* Baptism, either by *A Believing Reception of Christ*, or by *The Living Word of Truth set forth in the Gospel:* it is clear, that, although, to such a person, Baptism, *subsequently* administered (as in

* See above, book ii. chap. 2.

the case of St. Paul, who was indisputably, I think, regenerated, through the mean of *A Believing Reception of Christ*, previous to his further instruction and actual baptism by Ananias), may be a visible sign of his profession or an official seal of his spiritual matriculation; still it cannot possibly *communicate* a Grace, which the Church has always rightly pronounced incapable of a *second communication*, and which in the supposed case has been *already communicated*.

And, again: if a person may be thus morally regenerated *without* Baptism, by the very circumstance of his having been morally regenerated *before* Baptism: then it is equally clear, that, should he never hereafter receive Baptism, being prevented by some insuperable obstacle or being cut off by the hand of death (as in the case of the penitent thief on the cross, who, like St. Paul, was regenerated through the mean of *A Believing Reception of Christ*, though unlike St. Paul, he never subsequently received Baptism); the circumstance of his never receiving the Outward Sign cannot undo what has *already* been done, cannot cause him to have *never* acquired that identical Moral Regeneration which all the while he in truth *has* acquired.

Now, in each of these modifications, I mean the BEFORE and the WITHOUT, since the individual has *not* been regenerated through the mean of Baptism, he must have been regenerated through

some *other* mean: and, accordingly, as we have seen, Scripture provides two other channels beside Baptism, through which the grace of Moral Regeneration may be communicated.

The subject being thus far sufficiently clear, we have now only to institute an inquiry as to the sentiments of the Early Church touching the possibility of Moral Regeneration being communicated, either *before* Baptism, or in some cases *without* any subsequent Baptism.

I. By reason of the state of persecution, more or less violent, in which the Church was placed during the long term of well nigh three centuries from the crucifixion of her Founder, cases would soon and frequently occur, which, for the satisfaction of all parties, would require a distinct adjudication.

An individual, we will say, who is hopefully passing through the preparatory stage of Catechumenism, is arrested by the satellites of power ere he has received the Washing of Baptism, and is dragged before the tribunal of some official tool of the regnant Pagan Tyranny. Suspected of being a votary of the new Superstition, he is commanded to clear himself, by abjuring Christ, and by throwing a handful of votive incense upon the altar of Jupiter. Obedience to such a command he declares to be conscientiously impossible: and he boldly professes himself to be a convinced and determined Christian. The result

of his good Confession is his immediate Martyrdom: but he dies, *without* having been baptised.

What judgment did the Primitive Church pronounce upon the future condition of an individual thus circumstanced?

1. Taking the recorded and divinely ruled case of the penitent, though never baptised, thief, as her guide and her precedent, she scrupled not, most reasonably and most scripturally, to determine: that, *To a person, who had been thus faithful unto death, the Lord would assuredly give a crown of life.*

But how can this be, it might be asked: seeing, that the recent Martyr can, by no possibility, have been regenerated through the medium of a Baptism which he never received; and further seeing, that, unless a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God?

We admit (so ran the reply of the Church), that, unless a man be born again, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God: and we also admit and duly teach, that Outward Baptism is an appointed mean of Moral Regeneration: and we furthermore admit, as doubtless we *must* admit the notorious fact, that, to our martyred Catechumen, Baptism has never been administered. But what then? Behold the penitent thief on the cross: who, *without* Baptism by water, acknowledged, and through faith received, his dying Saviour. Shall we presume to say, in opposition to the

Lord's own testimony; that, to *him*, no power was given to become a son of God? Shall we presume, in deference for some human Scheme of well rounded Technical Theology, to deny; that *he* was born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God himself by the direct agency of the Holy Spirit? Such impiety be far from us! As the penitent thief may be said to have been baptised in his own blood: so likewise in his own blood, may we equally say, was our martyred Catechumen baptised. He received, indeed, no Baptism by water: but his very resisting unto blood shewed him to have been *already* a truly regenerated person. On the ground, then, of his having assuredly received the Inward Grace of Moral Regeneration, through a medium specified by Scripture itself, even *The Living Word of Truth* delivered to him catechumenically from the Sincere Gospel: on this ground, we doubt not of our departed brother having also attained to everlasting Salvation.

Such was the decision of the Church: and we may easily verify it by the adduction of adequate testimony.

(1.) Let us first hear the statement of the venerable Cyprian.

Such Catechumens, as died without Baptism, held the sound faith and unity of the Church: and, to assail the Devil, they advanced, from the divine

camp, with a full and sincere knowledge of God the Father and Christ and the Holy Ghost. Nor, in truth, were they deprived of the Sacrament of Baptism, since they were baptised with the most glorious and the most exalted Baptism of Blood: concerning which even our Lord himself said, that he had another Baptism wherewithal to be baptised. But, that those, who are baptised in their own blood, and who are sanctified by their own sufferings, are completed and obtain the grace of the divine promise: the same Lord declares in the Gospel, when he addresses the thief believing and confessing in the very agony of suffering, and when he promises that he should be with him in Paradise.*

(2.) Let us next hear the official language of Cyril of Jerusalem.

If any one receive not Baptism, neither hath he salvation: except the Martyrs only, who even with-

* Sciant igitur hujusmodi homines, suffragatores et fautores hæreticorum, Catechumenos illos, primo, integram fidem et Ecclesiæ unitatem tenere, et ad debellandum diabolum de divinis castris cum plena et sincera Dei Patris et Christi et Spiritus Sancti cognitione procedere; deinde, nec privari Baptismi sacramento, utpote qui baptizentur gloriosissimo et maximo sanguinis baptismo, de quo et Dominus dicebat habere se aliud baptisma baptizari. Sanguine autem suo baptizatos, et passione sanctificatos, consummari et divinæ pollicitationis gratiam consequi: declarat in Evangelio idem Dominus, quando ad latronem, in ipsa passione credentem et confitentem, loquitur; et, quod secum futurus sit in paradiso, pollicetur. Cyprian. Epist. lxxiii. Oper. vol. ii. p. 208.

out Water, receive the kingdom. For, when the Saviour redeemed the world through the cross, from his wounded side he sent forth Blood and Water: thus indicating, that those who live in times of peace should be baptised in Water, and that those who live in times of persecution should be baptised in their own Blood.—And, truly, the Martyrs confess: that they are made a spectacle to the world and to angels and to men.*

(3.) Next let us attend to the parallel evidence of Athanasius.

God hath given, to the nature of man, three

* Εἴτις μὴ λάβῃ τὸ βάπτισμα, σωτηρίαν οὐκ ἔχει, πλὴν μόνον μαρτύρων, οἱ καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ ὕδατος λαμβάνουσι τὴν βασιλείαν. Λυτρούμενος γὰρ τὴν οἰκουμένην, ὁ Σωτὴρ, διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν νυγεὶς, ἐξήγαγεν αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ· ἵνα οἱ μὲν ἐν καιροῖς εἰρήνης ἐν ὕδατι βαπτισθῶσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐν καιροῖς διωγμῶν ἐν οἰκείοις αἵμασιν βαπτισθῶσι. —Καὶ οἱ μὲν μάρτυρες ὁμολόγουσι, θέατρον τῷ κόσμῳ γενόμενοι, καὶ ἀγγέλοις, καὶ ἀνθρώποις. Cyril. Hieros. Catech. iii. p. 19, 20.

When Cyril, like Augustine, intimates, that, *If a person receive not Baptism, neither has he salvation*, he must, I suppose, be understood, as Augustine explains himself. A case is supposed of a person, who *might have* Baptism, but who scornfully or with an evil purpose *refused* it.

Baptismus quidem potest inesse, ubi Conversio Cordis defuerit: Conversio autem Cordis potest quidem inesse, non percepto Baptismo; sed, contempto, non potest. Neque enim ullo modo dicenda est Conversio Cordis ad Deum, cum Dei Sacramentum contemnitur. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 25. Oper. vol. vii. p. 53.

With this explanation, which indeed is sufficiently obvious, the language of Cyril is correct.

Baptisms, which are capable of purifying from every sin: that, through Water; and that, through a Person's own Blood in Martyrdom; and that, through Tears *.

(4.) We may further listen to the familiar language of Jerome.

The Blood and the Water, which flowed from the wound in Christ's side, exhibited a type of Martyrdom and baptism, through which lies the road to heaven †.

His side, wounded with a lance, flowed with Water and Blood, dedicating to us Baptism and Martyrdom ‡.

(5.) Very profitably also may we hear the parallel testimony of Augustine.

Whosoever, even without a reception of the Washing of Regeneration, die for the confession of Christ: this avails as much to the doing away of sin, as if they had been washed in the sacred fountain of Baptism §.

* Τρία βαπτίσματα, καθάρτικα πάσης οἵας δήποτε ἁμαρτίας, ὁ Θεὸς τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐδωρήσατο· λέγω δὲ, τὸ ὕδατος, καὶ πάλιν τὸ διὰ μαρτυρίας τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, καὶ τρίτον τὸ διὰ δακρύων. Athan. Quæst. ad Antioch. quæst. lxxii. Oper. vol. ii. p. 296.

† Sed et sanguis et aqua, quæ de vulnere lateris ejus exiit, Martyrii Baptismique prætulit typum, per quod itur ad cœlum. Hieron. Comment. in Psalm. lxix. 27. Oper. vol. vii. p. 84.

‡ Latus, lancea vulneratum, aquis fluxit et sanguine, Baptismum nobis et Martyrium dedicans. Hieron. Comment. in Esai. xlviii. 21. Oper. vol. iv. p. 155.

§ Nam quicunque, etiam non percepto Regenerationis la-

No man becomes a member of Christ, except either by Baptism in Christ, or by Death for Christ. Whence also that thief, not a follower of the Lord before his crucifixion, but a confessor in his crucifixion (from whom, sometimes, a prejudication against the Sacrament of Baptism is either caught at or attempted), is reckoned, by the holy Cyprian, among the Martyrs, who are baptised in their own Blood: a circumstance, which in the heat of persecution, befel many who had never been baptised with Water.—When the faith of the disciples faded, then did his faith flourish from the dead wood.—They despaired, concerning the Saviour dying: he hoped in the Saviour, dying along with himself. They fled away from the author of life: he prayed to the associate of his punishment. They bewailed his death, as the death of a man: he believed, that, after death, he would reign triumphant. They deserted the sponsor of their salvation: he honoured the companion of his cross. In him, who even then believed in Christ, was found the full stature of a Martyr: they, who were hereafter to be Martyrs, were then found wanting. And this was clear to the eyes of the Lord: hence, to him, not indeed baptised, but washed (as it were) in the

vacro, pro Christi confessione moriuntur: tantum eis valet ad dimittenda peccata, quantum si abluerentur sacro fonte Baptismatis. August. de Civit. Dei. lib. xiii. c. 7. Oper. vol. v. p. 139.

Blood of Martyrdom, he immediately gave such a measure of felicity *.

2. Nothing can be more beautiful and more poetical, than that fiction in Theology, if I may so speak, the *Baptism of the Martyrs in their own Blood:* but still, if we descend to the more humble region of unadorned prose, the simple fact is, that, like the penitent thief on the cross, the particular Martyrs in question, being taken out of the class of the Catechumens, were *never* baptised at all.

Yet, we see, the Primitive Church, with one voice, and (as it were) by triumphant acclamation, pronounced them to have been regenerated,

* Nemo fit membrum Christi, nisi aut baptismate in Christo, aut morte pro Christo. Unde et latroille, non ante crucem Domini sectator, sed in cruce confessor; de quo nonnunquam præjudicium captatur, sive tentatur, contra Baptismatis sacramentum: a Cypriano sancto inter Martyres computatur, qui suo sanguine baptizantur; quod, plerisque non baptizatis, fervente persecutione, provenit.—Tunc enim fides ejus de ligno floruit, quando discipulorum marcuit.—Illi enim desperaverunt de moriente: ille speravit in commoriente. Refugerunt illi authorem vitæ: rogavit ille consortem pœnæ. Doluerunt illi, tanquam hominis mortem: credidit ille, regnaturum esse post mortem. Deseruerunt illi sponsorem salutis: honoravit ille socium crucis. Inventa est in eo mensura Martyris, qui tunc in Christum credidit: quando defecerunt, qui futuri erant Martyres. Et hoc quidem oculis Domini clarum fuit: qui, non baptizato, tanquam Martyrii sanguine abluto, tantam felicitatem statim contulit. August. de Anim. et ejus Orig. ad Renat. lib. i. c. 9. Oper. vol. vii. p. 428.

because she pronounced them to have been saved: inasmuch as our Lord himself has determined, that, *without* Regeneration, it is morally impossible for a man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.

Therefore, indisputably, from the very premises, she must have held and taught: that, so far from Moral Regeneration being unattainable *without* the reception of Outward Baptism, a man, under particular circumstances, might die assuredly regenerate, even though Outward Baptism had *never been at all* administered to him. In other words, quite agreeably to Scripture, she must have held and taught: that there are certain means or channels, *altogether distinct* from Baptism, through which God, by his Spirit, is sometimes pleased to communicate the grace of Moral Regeneration.

II. Nor was the case of unbaptised Martyrs the *sole* case, which called forth the interpretative judgment of the Church.

A person, deeply convinced of the truth of the Gospel, animated by a living Faith in Christ, and exhibiting the soundness of his spiritual condition by the consistent holiness of his life, dies, while yet in the class of the Catechumens, without receiving Baptism: or, it may be, by some insurmountable obstacle, and certainly not by any profane contempt of Christ's holy ordinance, is prevented from being, as he proposed, at some

appointed time, baptised; and then, ere he had the power to present himself at the sacred font, is unexpectedly called away into another world.

Is that man, thus or similarly circumstanced (for it is easy to imagine an endless variety of innocently preventing occurrences), though doubtless not a Martyr, yet to be deemed a lost soul: merely because, with thoroughly good intentions and purposes, he was precluded from receiving the initiatory rite of Baptism: a rite, which, in his case, could not be any thing more than what Tertullian calls an *Obsignation of Faith* *?

1. Here, again the Ancient Church, most justly and most rationally decided: that *The Salvation, and consequently the preparatory Regeneration, of a man thus circumstanced, was not to be doubted of.*

Had the individual profanely *despised* the divine ordinance of Baptism; and had he, on the ground of its nugatoriness and inutility, *refused* to partake of the blessed Sacrament: then this very temper, involving plain and insolent rebellion against God, would have shewn him to be unworthy of the offered privilege; and thus, from his own mouth and by his own practice, he would have stood self-condemned, as a presumptuous unregenerate sinner, in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity.

Or again, had he, from time to time, *wilfully deferred* the rite, not indeed in a spirit of auda-

* Obsignatio fidei. Tertull. de Pœnit. § vii. Oper. p. 481.

cious rebellion, but in order that he might actually make it the minister and encourager of sin ; deferring it to the last, as a sure and infallible mode of compendiously washing out all his offences, when, with full deliberation of purpose, he should have previously taken his swing in rapine or worldliness or debauchery : then, no less, would he have stood, before God and the Church, self-convicted and self-condemned of systematically sinning in order that grace might abound.

Or even yet again, had he *wantonly deferred* the rite, in the careless and secular and indifferent humour of those in the parable, who variously pleaded to be excused attendance upon the nobleman's banquet, on the ground, that *this* had bought a piece of ground and must needs go and see it, that *that* had bought five yoke of oxen and must go to prove them, and that *another* had married a wife and therefore could not come : he would still, by this sort of civilly apologetic though thinly disguised contempt, have abundantly shewn ; that, with such a temper of mind, Moral Regeneration, in the very nature of things, is plainly inconsistent and impossible.

But *his* case was the reverse of any one of these three supposed cases. *He* honoured Baptism : *he* loathed sin : in all his habits, and in the entire bent of his mind, *he* was a new man : *he* fully purposed to seek the cleansing laver of Regeneration : death, or untoward circumstances

before death over which he had no controul, alone prevented *him*. With full confidence, therefore, the Ancient Church committed his soul to the sure mercy of God through Jesus Christ: and, after her, to the same effect speaks the Church of England, when, in the office of Baptism for such as are of riper years, she inculcates *the great necessity of the Sacrament* WHERE IT MAY BE HAD *.

2. For evidence on the present point, it will be sufficient to hear the testimony of Augustine.

That suffering sometimes supplies the place and discharges the functions of Baptism, is demonstrated by our Lord's address to that unbaptised thief: To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise. *Such is the no slight argument of the blessed Cyprian.*

* Exactly in the same spirit of theologising, the Anglican Church, in her Catechism, defines the two Sacraments to be GENERALLY *necessary to salvation.*

By the word GENERALLY, she means *generically*, as opposed to *specifically*: just as, in her seventeenth Article, she uses the same word GENERALLY in the same sense and with the same intentional opposition. See my Primitive Doctrine of Election. book ii. chap. 9. § I. 1. (2.)

Generically, or to the Church corporately, the two Sacraments, viewed as the ordinary channels of conveying certain graces without the possession of which we cannot be saved, are necessary to salvation.

But, *specifically*, or in sundry individual excepted cases, they are not necessary to salvation: because the graces in question may be, and often are, conveyed to individuals through other appointed means or channels.

But, on full consideration, the matter must be carried still further.

Not only may suffering for the name of Christ supply, what from Baptism might be wanting: but also Faith and Conversion of Heart, if perchance, in troublesome times, there should be no opportunity of celebrating the Sacrament of Baptism. For neither was that thief crucified, in real Martyrdom, for the name of Christ: but he suffered for the deserts of his own evil deeds. Nor yet did he suffer, because he believed: but he believed, while he suffered. How much, then, may that saying of the Apostle, Believe with the heart unto righteousness and confess with the mouth to salvation, *avail, even without the visible Sacrament of Baptism: for thus are we plainly taught by the case of that robber. But still, be it carefully observed: that such an invisible completeness only occurs, when the due administration of Outward Baptism is excluded, not by a contempt of the ordinance, but solely* BY THE ARTICLE OF NECESSITY.—

In whatsoever profiting of the inner man, no person, if perhaps, before Baptism, he may have profited, with a pious heart, even unto Spiritual Intellectuality, ought to despise the Sacrament: which, indeed, is corporally applied by the operation of ministers; but, through which, God spiritually operates the consecration of the individual.*

* Baptismi sane vicem aliquando implere passionem, de

Baptism may be present, where Conversion of the Heart is wanting: and, contrariwise, Conversion of the Heart may be present, where Baptism has never been received. This last, however, is impossible, where Baptism is profanely despised: for, by no means, must we say, that there is Conversion of the Heart to God, when the Sacrament of God is contemned.*

latrone illo, cui non baptizato dictum est *Hodie mecum eris in Paradiso*, non leve documentum idem beatus Cyprianus assumit.

Quod etiam atque etiam considerans, invenio, non tantum passionem pro nomine Christi id quod ex Baptismo deerat posse supplere, sed etiam Fidem Conversionem que cordis, si forte ad celebrandum Mysterium Baptismi in angustiis temporum succurri non potest. Neque enim latro ille pro nomine Christi crucifixus est: sed pro meritis facinorum suorum. Nec, quia credidit, passus est: sed, dum patitur, credidit. Quantum itaque valeat, etiam sine visibili sacramento Baptismi, quod ait Apostolus, *Corde creditur ad justitiam, ore autem confessio fit ad salutem*, in illo latrone declaratum est: sed tunc impletur invisibiliter, cum ministerium Baptismi, non contemptus religionis, sed articulus necessitatis, excludit.—

Usque adeo nemo debet, in quolibet provectu interioris hominis, si forte ante Baptismum usque ad Spiritalem Intellectum pio corde profecerit, contemnere sacramentum, quod ministrorum opere corporaliter adhibetur: sed, per hoc, Deus hominis consecrationem spiritaliter operatur. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 22. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52.

* Baptismus quidem potest inesse, ubi Conversio Cordis defuerit: Conversio autem Cordis potest quidem inesse, non percepto Baptismo; sed, contempto, non potest. Neque enim ullo modo dicenda est Conversio Cordis ad Deum, cum

In the language of Augustine, as we have already seen, *Conversion of Heart* is the synonyme of *Moral Regeneration:* for he pronounces this *Conversion* to be the Inward Grace of the Mystery or Sacrament of Baptism. It is impossible, I think, to misunderstand him: and nothing

Dei Sacramentum contemnitur. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 25. Oper. vol. vii. p. 53.

I may add, that Ambrose speaks exactly to the same effect respecting the Emperor Valentinian, who wished to receive Baptism, but was prevented by death.

Audio vos dolere, quod non acceperit Sacramenta Baptismatis. Dicite mihi, quid aliud in nobis est, nisi voluntas, nisi petitio? Atqui etiam dudum hoc voti habuit, ut et, antequam in Italiam venisset, initiaretur: et proximè baptizari se a me velle significavit; et ideo, præ cæteris causis, me accersendum putavit. Non habet ergo gratiam, quam desideravit: non habet, quam poposcit? Certè, quia poposcit, accepit. Et unde illud est: *Justus quacumque morte præventus fuerit, anima ejus in requie erit.*—Pater Sancte,—qui habuit Spiritum tuum, quomodo non accepit gratiam tuam?

Aut si, quia solemniter non sunt celebrata mysteria, hoc movet: ergo nec Martyres, si Catechumeni fuerint, coronentur; non enim coronantur, si non initiantur. Quod si suo abluuntur sanguine: et hunc sua pietas abluit et voluntas. Ambros. de Obit. Valentinian. Consol. § 51, 52, 53. Oper. vol. ii. col. 1188.

Yet Ambrose very justly held, that, where Baptism might be had, Faith alone was insufficient for christian Perfection or Initiation.

Nec enim fides sola ad Perfectionem satis est, nisi etiam Baptismatis adipiscatur gratiam. Ambros. Epist. Class. i. Epist. 7. § 20. Oper. vol. ii. col. 782.

can be more reasonable, nothing more agreeable to the whole analogy of Scripture, than the entire decision which he has recorded. But, still, the inevitable result is: that *The Primitive Church maintained the possibility of a man being morally regenerated, without, and altogether independently of, External Baptism.* Whence the further result is: that, *Agreeably to Scripture, she must also have taught the existence of certain other means or channels of Moral Regeneration, beside that mean of Baptism, through which, as Augustine justly remarks, God spiritually operates the consecration of the individual.*

III. In full accordance with these results, we find the early Fathers: sometimes speaking of Regeneration or Renovation or Conversion or the Formation of Christ in the believer, without any reference or allusion to Baptism; sometimes specially noticing its conveyance, through one of the other channels specified in Holy Writ; sometimes exhibiting it, rather as a reason for, than as a consequence of, Baptism; and sometimes, precisely in the manner of St. John, directing us to moral evidence in proof of its existence, and denying its existence without such evidence even though the individual himself may have been duly and canonically baptised.

Of such language I shall proceed to adduce some specimens.

1. Let us first hear Clement of Rome.

What recompense shall we give unto Christ, or what fruit worthy of all that he hath given unto us? What a debt of piety do we owe unto him? He bountifully bestowed upon us Illumination: as a father, he called us sons: when perishing, he saved us. What praise, then, shall we give unto him, or what payment of recompense for the things which we have received? We were blinded in mind, worshippers of stocks and stones and gold and silver and brass, the works of men's hands: and our whole life was nothing else than death. Thus surrounded with darkness, and in our vision full of such mistiness, we at length recovered our sight, laying aside, through his will, the cloud wherewithal we were encompassed. Truly, indeed, he had mercy upon us, and pitied us, and saved us: having beheld in us much error and ruin, and seeing that we had no hope of Salvation except through him. For he called us, when we (morally) *existed not: and, out of* (moral) *non-entity, he willed our existence* *.

* The context, I think, plainly shews, that Clement (as I have taken the liberty of representing him) here speaks, not of our first or physical creation, but of our new or moral creation.

If, on this point, there could be any reasonable doubt, the illative particle *For* (γὰρ), as it occurs in the latter sentence, would forthwith determine the matter.

He had mercy upon us, and pitied us, and saved us: having beheld in us much error and ruin, and seeing that we had no hope of salvation except through him. FOR *he called us, when we existed not: and, out of non-entity, he willed our existence.*

The particle *For* connects the latter of these two sentences

Rejoice, therefore, thou barren that bearest not: break forth and shout, thou that travailest not. For the children of her that is desolate are more, than those of her that hath a husband. When he saith, Rejoice thou barren that bearest not, *he meaneth us: for our Church was barren, before children were given unto her*.*

2. Next let us hear Ignatius.

with its predecessor: and thus makes its import to be; that *Christ called us when we existed not and willed our existence out of non-entity,* BECAUSE *he had mercy upon us and pitied us and saved us,* WHEN *we were in much error and ruin, and* WHEN *we had no hope of salvation except through him.*

According to this necessary construction, the creation spoken of must inevitably be a *Moral creation:* or, in other words, it must be *Fallen Man's Moral Regeneration.*

* Τίνα οὖν ἡμεῖς αὐτῷ δώσομεν ἀντιμισθίαν, ἢ τίνα καρπὸν ἄξιον οὗ ἡμῖν αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν; Πόσα δὲ αὐτῷ ὀφείλομεν ὅσια; Τὸ φῶς γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσατο, ὡς πατὴρ υἱοὺς ἡμᾶς προσηγόρευσεν, ἀπολλυμένους ἡμᾶς ἔσωσεν. Ποῖον οὖν αἶνον αὐτῷ δώσομεν, ἢ μισθὸν ἀντιμισθίας ὧν ἐλάβομεν; Πηροὶ ὄντες τῇ διανοίᾳ, προσκυνοῦντες λίθους καὶ ξύλα καὶ χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ χαλκὸν, ἔργα ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ βίος ἡμῶν ὅλος ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἦν εἰ μὴ θάνατος. Ἀμαύρωσιν οὖν περικείμενοι, καὶ τοιαύτης ἀχλύος γέμοντες, ἐν τῇ ὁράσει, ἀνεβλέψαμεν, ἀποθέμενοι ἐκεῖνο ὁ περικείμεθα νέφος, τῇ αὐτοῦ θελήσει. Ἠλέησεν γὰρ ἡμᾶς, καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἔσωσεν, θεασάμενος ἐν ἡμῖν πολλὴν πλάνην καὶ ἀπώλειαν, καὶ μηδεμίαν ἐλπίδα ἔχοντας σωτηρίας, εἰ μὴ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ. Ἐκάλεσεν γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐκ ὄντας, καὶ ἠθέλησεν ἐκ μὴ ὄντος εἶναι ἡμᾶς. Εὐφράνθητι στεῖρα ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα, ῥῆξον καὶ βόησον ἡ οὐκ ὠδίνουσα· ὅτι πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου, μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἐχούσης τὸν ἄνδρα. Ὅ εἶπεν, Εὐφράνθητι στεῖρα ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα, ἡμᾶς εἶπεν· στεῖρα γὰρ ἦν ἡ ἐκκλησία ἡμῶν, πρὸ τοῦ δοθῆναι αὐτῇ τέκνα. Clem. Rom. Epist. ii. § 1, 2.

*Ye are all fellow-travellers, God-bearers, and Temple-bearers, and Christ-bearers, and Sanctity-bearers, adorned in all respects with the commandments of Jesus Christ: in whom also I rejoice, that, through what I am now writing, I have been thought worthy to converse with you and to joy together with you, because, according to this other life, ye love nothing save God alone *.*

3. Let us next attend to Irenèus.

The breathing into him of life, which makes the animal man, is one thing: and the Vivifying Spirit, which makes the spiritual man, is another thing.—The breath of life is given in common to all: but the Spirit is given only to those, who trample under foot earthly lusts.—Hence the breathing is temporal: but the Spirit is eternal. And the breathing, indeed, being increased in measure and remaining for a certain season, finally departs, leaving without breath that in which it previously was: but the Spirit, surrounding the man both inwardly and outwardly, always preserves, and never quits him. But, says the Apostle addressing us men, the spiritual is not first in order, but the animal: and, afterward, according to right reason, that which is spiritual.—As, therefore, he, who was made a living

* Ἐστὲ οὖν καὶ σύνοδοι πάντες, Θεοφόροι, καὶ Ναοφόροι, Χριστοφόροι, ἁγιοφόροι, κατὰ πάντα κεκοσμημένοι ἐντολαῖς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· οἷς καὶ ἀγαλλιῶμαι ὅτι ἠξιώθην, δι' ὧν γράφω, προσομιλῆσαι ὑμῖν, καὶ συγχαρῆναι, ὅτι κατ' ἄλλον βίον οὐδὲν ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰ μὴ μόνον τὸν Θεόν. Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. § 9.

soul, turning aside to evil, lost his life: so, conversely, that same person, turning back to good and receiving the Vivifying Spirit, shall find life. For the person, who is vivified, is not a different person from him who was dead.—The Apostle, therefore, saith, in his Epistle to the Colossians: Mortify your members, which are upon the earth. *What these are, he himself hath explained:* fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness which is idolatry. *The Apostle loudly heralds the laying aside of these: and he declares, that they, who do such things, as being only flesh and blood, cannot possess the kingdom of heaven. Put off, therefore, the Old Man with his works:—and put on the New Man, which is renewed in knowledge, according to the image of him who created him. In that he saith,* Which is renewed in knowledge, *he shews: that the man, who before was ignorant of God, is renewed by that knowledge which is toward him.* FOR THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD RENEWETH A MAN*.

* Aliud enim est afflatus vitæ, qui et animalem efficit hominem: et aliud Spiritus Vivificans, qui et spiritalem efficit eum. —Afflatum quidem communiter omni, qui super terram est, populo, dicens datum: Spiritum autem, propriè his, qui conculcant terrenas concupiscentias.—Afflatus igitur temporalis: Spiritus autem, sempiternus. Et afflatus quidem, auctus ad modicum, et tempore aliquo manens, deinde obiit, sine spiramento relinquens illud in quo fuit ante. Spiritus autem, circumdans intus et foris hominem, quippe semper perseverans, nunquam relinquens eum. Sed, *non primo quidem spiritale est,*

4. Let us next listen to Tertullian.

That Laver is the sealing of Faith: which Faith begins and is commended from the faith of Penitence. We are baptised, not that we may cease from sinning, but because we have already ceased, inasmuch as we have already been baptised in the heart *.

5. Let us next hear Athanasius.

God not only created them men, but likewise called them sons, as having begotten them: for the very term SON *implies and involves the idea of a Begetting; as where he says by the prophet,* I have begotten sons and brought them up. *And, on the*

ait Apostolus (hæc tanquam ad nos homines dicens); *sed primo quidem animale est, deinde quod spiritale est.*—Apostolus, in Epistola ad Colossenses, ait: *Mortificate itaque membra vestra, quæ sunt super terram.* Quæ sunt hæc, ipse exposuit: *fornicationem, immunditiam, passionem, concupiscentiam malam, et avaritiam quæ est idolatria.* Horum depositionem Apostolus præconatur: et *eos, qui talia perpetrant,* velut carnem et sanguinem tantum existentes, *non posse,* ait, *regnum cœlorum possidere.* — *Spoliantes vos veterem hominem cum operibus ejus:—et induentes novum hominem, qui renovatur in agnitionem, secundum imaginem ejus qui creavit eum.* In eo, ergo, quod ait, *Qui renovatur in agnitionem,* demonstrabat: quoniam ipse ille, qui ignorans erat antè homo, id est ignorans Deum, per eam, quæ in eum est, agnitionem, renovatur. Agnitio enim Dei renovat hominem. Iren. adv. hær. lib. v. c. 13. p. 330, 331.

* Lavacrum illud obsignatio est Fidei: quæ Fides, a Pœnitentiæ fide, incipitur et commendatur. Non ideo abluimur, ut delinquere desinamus, sed quia desiimus, quoniam jam corde loti sumus. Tertull. de Pœnit. § 7. Oper. p. 481.

whole, whenever Scripture would indicate a son, it expresses the notion, not by the term CREATION, *but by the term* BEGETTING. *This, accordingly, John well knew, when he said:* He gave unto them power to become the sons of God, who were born, not from blood nor from the will of man, but from God. *Here we may note the excellent distinction which he makes. He uses the word* BECOME: *because he would say, that they are called sons, not by nature, but by adoption. And he uses the expression* WERE BORN: *because he would intimate, that they had altogether received the name of Sons. Such is the philanthropy of God: that, of those, of whom he is the Creator, afterward, through grace, he becomes also the Father. But he becomes their Father, when men, who have already been created, receive, as the Apostle speaks, into their hearts, the Spirit of God crying, Abba, Father. These are they, who, having received the word, have received from him power to become the sons of God. Otherwise, by nature being only creatures, they would never have become sons, unless they had received the Spirit of him who is by nature the true Son. From this it may be shewn, that we are not sons by nature, but that such alone is the Son who is within us: and, conversely, it may be shewn, that God is not our Father by nature, but that he is only the Father of the Word within us, in whom, and on account of whom, we cry, Abba, Father.—Hence we are not first begotten,*

but we are first made: for it is written, Let us make man. *Afterward, when we have received the grace of the Spirit, we are said also to be begotten* *.

Since the Father is Light and since the Son is Splendor from him, we should not grudge to use the same phraseology respecting them both. Thus, in the Son, we may behold the Spirit in whom we are illuminated: for, says the Apostle, That he may give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation,

* Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Θεὸς, οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώπους αὐτοὺς ἔκτισεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ υἱοὺς ἐκάλεσεν ὡς γεννήσας αὐτοὺς· τοῦ γὰρ ΤΙΟΣ, καὶ ὧδε σημαντικὸν ἐστι τὸ Ἐγέννησεν. Ὡς καὶ, διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, φησὶν· Τίους ἐγέννησα καὶ ὕψωσα. Καὶ ὅλον ὅτε ἡ γραφὴ Τίὸν σημᾶναι βούλεται, οὐ διὰ τῆς ΕΚΤΙΣΑ, ἀλλὰ πάντως διὰ τῆς ΕΓΕΝΝΗΣΑ, λέξεως σημαίνει. Καὶ τοῦτο πάλιν οἶδεν Ἰωάννης, λέγων· Ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, οἱ, οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων, οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ, ἐγεννήθησαν· πάνυ καλῶς ἐχούσης ἐνταῦθα τῆς παρατηρήσεως· τὸ μὲν ΓΕΝΕΣΘΑΙ, διὰ τὸ μὴ φύσει, ἀλλὰ θέσει, αὐτοῦ λέγεσθαι υἱοὺς, φήσι· τὸ δὲ ΕΓΕΝΝΗΘΗΣΑΝ, διὰ τὸ ὅλως ὄνομα υἱοῦ καὶ αὐτοὺς εἰληφέναι, εἴρηκεν.—Αὐτὴ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρώπια ἐστὶν· ὅτι, ὢν ἐστι ποιητὴς, τούτων καὶ πατὴρ ὕστερον, κατὰ χάριν, γίνεται. Γίνεται δὲ, ὅταν οἱ κτισθέντες ἄνθρωποι, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ ἀπόστολος, λάβωσιν εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἑαυτῶν τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, κράζον, Ἀββᾶ, ὁ Πατὴρ. Οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν, ὅσοι, δεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον, ἔλαβον ἐξουσίαν παρ' αὐτοῦ τέκνα Θεοῦ γένεσθαι. Ἄλλως δὲ οὐκ ἂν γένοιντο υἱοὶ, ὄντες φύσει κτίσματα· εἰ μὴ, τοῦ ὄντος φύσει καὶ ἀληθινοῦ Τίοῦ, τὸ Πνεῦμα ὑποδέξονται.—Ὥστε καὶ ἐκ τούτου δείκνυσθαι, μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς φύσει υἱοὺς, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐν ἡμῖν Τίὸν· καὶ μὴ εἶναι πάλιν ἡμῶν φύσει πατέρα τὸν Θεὸν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν Λόγου, ἐν ᾧ καὶ δι' ὃν κράζομεν, Ἀββᾶ, ὁ Πατὴρ.—Διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν ἡμεῖς οὐ πρῶτον γεννώμεθα, ἀλλὰ ποιούμεθα· γέγραπται γὰρ, Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον. Ὕστερον δὲ δεξάμενοι τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριν, λεγόμεθα τότε λοιπὸν καὶ γεννᾶσθαι. Athan. cont. Arian. Orat. iii. Oper. vol. i. p. 232, 233.

the eyes of your heart being illuminated in the knowledge of him. *But, when we are illuminated by the Spirit, it is Christ who illuminates us in him: for, saith John,* He was the true Light, which illuminates every man that cometh into the world. *And, again, since the Father is the Fountain and the Son is called the River, we are said to drink the Spirit: for it is written, that* We all have been made to drink of one Spirit. *But, when we drink the Spirit, we drink Christ: for* They drank of that Spiritual Rock which followed them; and that Rock was Christ. *And, yet again, Christ being the true Son, we, when we receive the Spirit, are made sons: for* Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear, but ye have received the Spirit of adoption. *Wherefore, being made sons by the Spirit, we are called, in Christ, the sons of God: for,* As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God *.

* Τοῦ τοίνυν Πατρὸς φωτὸς, τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος αὐτοῦ, τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ περὶ τούτων μάλιστα οὐκ ὀκνήτεον λέγειν πόλλακις. Ἔξεστιν ὁρᾶν, καὶ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ, τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐν ᾧ φωτιζόμεθα· Ἵνα, γὰρ φησὶν, δῴη ὑμῖν Πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ, πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας. Τῷ δὲ Πνεύματι φωτιζομένων ἡμῶν, ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστιν ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ φωτίζων· Ἦν, γὰρ φήσι, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινον, ὁ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Πάλιν τὲ, τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντος πηγῆς, τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ ποταμοῦ, λεγομένου, πίνειν λεγόμεθα τὸ Πνεῦμα· γέγραπται γὰρ, ὅτι Ἡμεῖς πάντες ἓν Πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν. Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ποτιζόμενοι, τὸν Χριστὸν πίνομεν· Ἔπινον, γὰρ, ἐκ πνευματίκης ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστὸς.

6. Finally, let us hear Augustine.

Behold, a man, when baptised, has received the Sacrament of his Nativity. He hath a Sacrament, and a great Sacrament, divine, holy, ineffable. Consider what it is: that it should even make a new man by the remission of all sins. Let him, however, attend to his heart, whether that be there perfected, which has been done in his body. Let him see, whether he has charity: and then let him say, I have been born of God. If he hath it not, he bears indeed a character impressed upon him: but he only wanders about as a deserter. Let him have charity: otherwise, let him not say, that he has been born of God.

But I have, says he, the Sacrament.

Hear, then the Apostle: If I know all sacraments, and have all faith so that I could remove mountains, and yet have not charity; I am nothing.

In the whole of St. John's Epistle, nothing is so much commended as charity: insomuch that, if the Apostle seems to introduce other subjects, he constantly returns to that topic, and would always

Καὶ πάλιν, τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὄντος ἀληθινοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἡμεῖς, τὸ Πνεῦμα λαμβάνοντες, υἱοποιούμεθα· Οὐ, γὰρ, ἐλάβετε, φήσι, πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον, ἀλλ' ἐλάβετε Πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας. Υἱοποιούμενοι δὲ τῷ Πνεύματι, δηλονότι ἐν Χριστῷ χρηματίξομεν τέκνα Θεοῦ· Ὅσοι, γάρ, ἔλαβον αὐτὸν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γένεσθαι. Athan. ad Serap. Spirit. Sanct. non esse creat. Oper. vol. i. p. 359.

refer to charity whatsoever he may happen to introduce.

Let us see, whether he does not do it here. Listen, then. Every one, who hath been born of God, doth not commit sin. *We ask: What sin? For, if every sin is literally to be understood, the explanation will run contrary to that passage:* If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. *Let him, then, specify: What sin he means.—*

Behold the entire drift and purpose of his circumlocution.

Every one, who is born of God, sinneth not: because his seed remaineth in him.

He means the seed of God, that is, the word of God. Hence the Apostle says: I have begotten you through the Gospel.

And he cannot sin, because he hath been born of God.

Let us see, then, in what he cannot sin.

In this are manifested the sons of God and the sons of the Devil. Every one, who is not righteous, is not of God: and he who loveth not his brother.

It is now clearly shewn, why he says: And he who loveth not his brother. *Love alone constitutes the distinction, between the sons of God, and the sons of the Devil. Let all sign themselves with the sign of the cross of Christ; let all answer, Amen; let all sing, Hallelujah; let all be bap-*

tised ; let all enter the churches ; let all build the walls of cathedrals : still, the sons of God, and the sons of the Devil, are only distinguished from each other by charity.

THEY, WHO HAVE CHARITY, HAVE BEEN BORN OF GOD : THEY, WHO HAVE NOT CHARITY, HAVE NOT BEEN BORN OF GOD *.

IV. It will perhaps be thought almost superfluous to make any formal remarks upon these passages : I shall, therefore, study brevity.

1. When Clement of Rome and Athanasius speak of *Light* or *Illumination*, I need scarcely, at this present stage of the inquiry, observe, that

* Ecce, accepit sacramentum nativitatis homo baptizatus. Sacramentum habet, et magnum sacramentum, divinum, sanctum, ineffabile. Considera quale : ut novum hominem faciat dimissione omnium peccatorum. Attendat tamen in cor, si perfectum est ibi, quod factum est in corpore. Videat, si habeat charitatem : et tunc dicat, *Natus sum a Deo.* Si autem non habet, characterem quidem impositam habet, sed desertor vagatur. Habeat charitatem : aliter, non se dicat natum a Deo.

Sed, habeo, inquit, *sacramentum.*

Audi Apostolum : *Si sciam omnia sacramenta, et habeam omnem fidem ita ut montes transferam, charitatem autem non habeam ; nihil sum.*

Hoc si meministis, commendavimus, cum istam Epistolam legere inciperemus, nihil in ea nobis sic commendari, quomodo charitatem. Et, si videatur alia et alia dicere, illuc facit reditum : et ad ipsam charitatem omnia vult referre, quæcunque dixerit.

Videamus, si et hic non facit. Attende. *Omnis, qui natus*

they mean no other than *Regeneration*: for, as we have seen, in the Early Church, the regular technical name of Regeneration was *Illumination*.

2. The same remark applies to the curiously varied phraseology of Ignatius.

By *Theophori* or *God-bearers*, by *Naophori* or *Temple-bearers*, and by *Christophori* or *Christ-bearers*, he alike would have us understand, *Those in whom Christ has been formed*, or *Those who by*

est ex Deo, non facit peccatum. Quærimus: Quod peccatum? Quia, si omne intellexeris, contrarius eris illi loco: *Si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nosmetipsos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est.* Ergo dicat: Quod peccatum.—

Videte, quia circuitus ille verborum hunc habet finem, hunc habet exitum.

Omnis, qui natus est ex Deo, non peccat: quia semen ejus in ipso manet.

Semen Dei; id est verbum Dei: unde dicit Apostolus; *Per Evangelium vos genui.*

Et non potest peccare, quia ex Deo natus est.

Dic adhuc, videamus in quo non potest peccare.

In hoc manifestati sunt, filii Dei, et filii Diaboli. Omnis, qui non est justus, non est a Deo; et qui non diligit fratrem suum.

Certè jam manifestum est, unde dicat: *Et qui non diligit fratrem suum.* Dilectio ergo sola discernit, inter filios Dei, et filios Diaboli. Signent se omnes signo crucis Christi; respondeant omnes, Amen; cantent omnes Hallelujah; baptizentur omnes; intrent ecclesias; faciant parietes basilicarum: non discernuntur filii Dei a filiis Diaboli, nisi charitate.

Qui habent charitatem, nati sunt ex Deo: qui non habent, non sunt nati ex Deo. August. in 1 Epist. Joan. Tractat. v. Oper. vol. ix. p. 220.

a New Creation have become the Temples of the Holy Ghost, or in other words, *Those who by the internal agency of God have been morally regenerated.*

This language of Ignatius, as Cotelerius justly notes, has been closely and indeed even verbally copied by Antiochus: and that writer clearly employs it in the very same sense as his predecessor; for, with *him*, a God-bearer or a Christ-bearer is a person universally adorned in the commandments of Jesus Christ *.

3. Tertullian distinctly teaches: that the Regeneration of the Heart may, and often does *precede* the Outward Baptism of the Body; which, in that case, must be viewed, as the sealing or ratifying of his *already* existent Faith. Hence, he must inevitably have held: that Baptism is, in no wise, the *sole* mean through which Moral Regeneration is communicated; but that there are certain *other* means also, through which the Holy Spirit is sometimes pleased to operate.

4. Those *other* means, two in number, are verbally referred to, and fully recognised by Athanasius, under the aspect of their being, along with the mean of *Outward Baptism*, propounded in Scripture: *A Believing Reception of Christ*, to wit: and *The Revealed Word of God or of Truth.*

* Ὁ τοιοῦτος γίνεται Θεοφόρος, ἤγουν Χριστοφόρος, καὶ ναὸς Θεοῦ, καὶ ἁγιοδόμος, κατὰ πάντα κεκοσμημένος ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Antioch. Homil. i.

5. Irenèus says much of the Vivifying Spirit in the work of Moral Regeneration: but he is silent respecting Baptism. By this, we are not to imagine, that he undervalues Baptism, or that he denies it to be a mean: we are only to suppose, that his subject rather led him to treat of a *different* mean, even the *Knowledge of God and his Christ received through the faithful preaching of the Revealed Word.*

Put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, according to the image of him who created him. In that he saith, Which is renewed in knowledge, *he shews: that the man, who previously was ignorant of God, is renewed by that knowledge which is toward him.* FOR THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD RENEWETH A MAN.

In the language of the Early Church, as we have repeatedly seen, *Renovation* and *Regeneration* and *Conversion* are synonymous terms. The Ancients seem to know nothing of that artificial distinction between them, which some Moderns would set up.

6. Lastly, Augustine, without either hesitation or ambiguity, copies St. John, in requiring us to verify the fact of our Moral Regeneration: not merely by a reference to our Baptism, as if all, who had been baptised, were *therefore*, as a matter of course, regenerated; but by a reference to the inward spirit of our minds, as exhibited in the christian charity of our outward life and conversation.

Let a man attend to his HEART, *whether that be there perfected* (or, in the technical language of the day, *ingrafted by mystical initiation* *), *which has been done in his* BODY. *Let him see, whether he has charity: and then let him say, I have been born of God. If he hath it not, he bears indeed a* CHARACTER (or outward mark) *impressed upon him: but he only wanders about as a* DESERTER. *Let him have charity: otherwise, let him not say that he has been born of God, though he be able to say I have the Sacrament.—The sons of God, and the sons of the Devil, are only distinguished from each other by charity.* THEY, WHO HAVE CHARITY, HAVE BEEN BORN OF GOD: THEY, WHO HAVE IT NOT, HAVE NOT BEEN BORN OF GOD.

* Augustine's *perfectum* is, I apprehend, equivalent to the τελείον and τελείωσις of the Greek Fathers.

BOOK III.

INFANT-BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

ANTIQUITY OF INFANT BAPTISM.

We now come to the most difficult part of the present Inquiry: the question of Infant-Baptism.

The difficulty, attendant upon it, lies: not in shewing the adoption of the practice into the Church from the very beginning; but in ascertaining, *Whether, in the case of Infant-Recipients, Moral Regeneration, invariably or not invariably, attends upon the administration of Outward Baptism*, and thence, *Still in the case of Infant-Recipients, whether Moral Regeneration ever is, or never is, communicated, independently of, and unconnectedly with, Outward Baptism.*

To settle this point, either in the way of argument from Scripture, or in the way of evidence from Antiquity, is certainly no easy matter: and

its very difficulty ought, I think, to teach the propriety of much temper and moderation in those, who, on whatever grounds, have been conducted to opposite conclusions. Perhaps a few words, touching the primeval use of Infant-Baptism, may not improperly introduce the present part of our Disquisition.

With respect, then, to the bare FACT of the *Use of Infant-Baptism in the Primitive Church*; as resting, both upon what was understood to be the sense of our Lord's command to baptise all nations, and upon what was known to be the practical interpretation of those passages in Holy Writ which mention the collective baptising of whole households, and upon the analogous administration of what was deemed the parallel Sacrament in the Levitical Church: this FACT, simply *as* a FACT, rests, if I mistake not, upon very sufficient and very unexceptionable testimony.

I. In the brief Remains of the Apostolical Fathers, as they are commonly designated, their subjects not leading them to touch upon the matter in hand, nothing, or at least nothing *literally* explicit, is said respecting it. But, in the next ecclesiastical succession, Justin Martyr has stated a circumstance, which imports, both that Infant-Baptism was used in the Primitive Church, and likewise that it had begun to be used (precisely as we might infer from Scripture) in the apostolic age itself.

Many men and many women among us, says he, *who have attained to the term of sixty or of seventy years, and who have been made disciples to Christ from their very childhood, remain from religious motives, in a state of celibacy* *.

* Καὶ πολλοί τίνες καὶ πολλαὶ ἑξηκοντοῦται καὶ ἑβδομηκοντοῦται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένουσι. Justin. Martyr. Apol. i. Oper. p. 48.

Dr. Brett, in his Dissertation on the Ancient Liturgies, makes some very remarkable, perhaps very startling, assertions, respecting *Prayers for the Dead*, which seriously involve both the Doctrine and the Practice of *Infant-Baptism*.

As a good deal has been said of late respecting the propriety of *Prayers for the Dead*, it may be useful to inquire, whether such assertions rest on any solid foundation.

When St. Paul, so argues Dr. Brett, comprehensively directed that *supplication should be made for* ALL *Saints*, he directed that they should be made for *departed Saints*, as well as for *living Saints*. Ephes. vi. 18.

Hence our author assures us, that *we even disobey Scripture, when we exclude from our prayers the faithful departed*: and, by way of evidence to this alleged duty, he roundly asserts, that *we have as early and as plain testimonies of the Church for Prayers for the Dead, as we have for Baptising Infants*.

On this ground, and collaterally likewise on the ground that *Prayers for the Dead occur in all the ancient Eucharistical Liturgies and were thence introduced into the earlier Anglican Liturgy of King Edward*, he, and those of his brethren who agreed with him, desired to have them restored in the present and later Anglican Liturgy. See Dissert. § 19. p. 274, 276, 284. Edit. A. D. 1838.

I. To find *an Absolute Scriptural Command to pray for the Dead*, in St. Paul's apparently very simple direction that *Supplication should be made for all Saints* or (in common par-

I. Now what are we to understand by the expression, *Who have been made disciples?*

lance) *for all Christians*, evinces, I must needs say, no small measure of hermeneutic ingenuity.

If so very *unexpected* a sense be indeed the *true* sense of the text, it must have been a sense familiar to the Church from the beginning, and must furthermore have been the regular scriptural proof of the bounden duty of offering up those Prayers for the Dead which doubtless occur in all the old Eucharistic Liturgies. But Dr. Brett produces not so much as a *single* primitive or even ancient authority for any such singular explication of St. Paul's language.

Jerome, when commenting upon the place, is evidently ignorant of the proposed interpretation: for he views it, as only marking St. Paul's great humility in reckoning himself as distinct and apart from all Saints. And the Catechist Cyril of Jerusalem, when assailed by the somewhat troublesome question, *Where is the benefit of Prayer for the Dead in the Liturgy of the Eucharist?* never stops the mouth of the questioner by alleging Dr. Brett's text, as being universally understood by the Church from the beginning to inculcate *the Duty of Supplication for Departed Saints*: but, on the contrary, he strives to meet him with a mere arbitrary *illustration*, which is not of the very slightest evidential value. Catech. Mystag. v. p. 241, 242.

Yet, on the strength of an exposition which (so far as appears) rests altogether upon Dr. Brett's own Insulated Private Judgment, we are actually told by him, that we even *disobey* Scripture, when we exclude the Faithful Departed from our Prayers: a sweeping accusation, which, if it could be sustained, would certainly place the Anglican Church and the Anglican Clergy in no particularly enviable position.

II. But, whether scriptural or unscriptural, Dr. Brett contends: that, at all events, as a FACT, *We have as early and*

The phrase in question is verbally identical with that employed by our Lord, when he charged his

as plain testimonies of Prayer for the Dead, as we have for Baptising Infants.

The harmony of the old Eucharistic Liturgies will afford no *legitimate* evidence to this effect: because it is well known that none of them were committed to writing until after the Council of Nice. Consequently, no man, without proof *aliundè*, can safely deny, that such Prayers were interpolations, *uniformly* at length introduced into all the old Eucharistic Liturgies when the practice of praying for the Dead, had *uniformly* (though, as we gather from Cyril, *not without opposition*) spread through the Church.

How, then, if we prudently resort to *testimony*, stands Dr. Brett's positive statement now before us?

From the evidence of Justin Martyr we distinctly collect, that the practice of Infant-Baptism, as exhibiting the true sense of our Lord's general command, was fully prevalent, not only when he wrote his first Apology or about fifty years after the death of St. John, but likewise in the very time of the Apostles themselves. Yet this same Justin Martyr, so far from attesting the *equal* antiquity of Prayer for the Dead, incidentally establishes the position that *No such practice was known in his days:* and thence demonstrates, that *The Prayers for the Dead in the old Eucharistic Liturgies are no better than the rank interpolations of a later age.*

In his first Apology, he gives a minute account, both of the primitive mode of conferring Baptism, and likewise of the primitive mode in which the Eucharist was celebrated, the newly baptised Catechumens always partaking of it. Justin. Apol. i. Oper. p. 73, 74, 76, 77.

This minute account he ushers in with an explicit declaration, that it was *meant* to be a minute account: for he says; *In what manner we offer ourselves unto God, after having been*

Apostles to *make disciples* out of all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

made new creatures through Christ, I shall now explain; lest, if I should pass this over, I should seem to act dishonestly in my narrative. p. 73.

Now, in this whole account, *professedly* full and minute, not the slightest hint is given, that, in the celebration of the Eucharist, as it was celebrated about the year 150, *any* Prayer was offered up for the Dead: nor could Justin, even if *inclined* to be dishonest in his detail which he avowedly and industriously disclaims, have had any *temptation* to suppress such a circumstance in a public Apology addressed to Pagans; for Pagans would not have thought a whit less favourably of Christianity, if the circumstance *had* been introduced.

We may be certain, therefore, that Prayer for the Dead formed no part of the *really* primeval Eucharistic Liturgy: for, if it *had*, Justin, standing self-pledged as an *honest* man, could not but have mentioned and described it.

Whence it will plainly follow: that Prayers for the Dead in the old Liturgies, as they *now* exist, are mere interpolations of an age or ages later than that of Justin: interpolations, which obviously sprang out of the dangerous Superstition which too soon pervaded the entire Church.

How Dr. Brett, with Justin before him, could have hazarded the assertion which has here been met, seems not a little extraordinary. He himself actually gives Justin's own account of Primitive Communion. p. 119—121.

III. If Dr. Brett's wish to have Prayer for the Dead restored to our Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy should ever be carried into effect, no ordinary inconvenience would follow from such a step.

1. Our Church has ruled, that *Whatever is not read in Holy Scripture, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of*

Hence, I suppose, there can be little doubt, that Justin alluded to the final charge of the ascending Saviour.

any man that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith. Art. vi.

Now, if Prayer for the Dead were introduced into our Eucharistic Liturgy, the *Duty and Benefit of the Practice* would clearly be imposed, as an Article of the Faith, upon the whole Anglican Church. For all would be precluded from either administering or receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, unless, by joining in such Prayer, they professed their adhesion to such Article: and yet, if proof from Holy Scripture were required, I know not where it could be found, save in Ephes. vi. 18 as expounded according to the Insulated Private Judgment of Dr. Brett.

He, indeed, has roundly declared it to be his Opinion, that St. Paul, in that text, so decidedly enforces the Duty of Prayer for the Dead, as to place all dissentients in the uncomely predicament of even *disobeying* Scripture. But then this is merely Dr. Brett's *own* Opinion, founded upon the principle of that Insulated Private Judgment which in our days is wont to perform such a multitude of theological wonders: and it seems probable, that the Opinion of *many others*, who have an *equal* right to enjoy their *own* Insulated Private Judgment, would in no wise coincide with that of Dr. Brett touching the true import of the text before us.

Surely, the Church of England would scarcely be warranted in imposing upon the consciences of her members, as an Article of the Faith, the mere Insulated Private Judgment of Dr. Brett and some few other respectable individuals touching the true sense of a single text in St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians.

2. Nor would even this be the worst part of the business.

It has often been alleged, that, if the Church of England

But these Sexagenarians and Septuagenarians had been *made disciples* from their very childhood.

Hence, when we recollect that Christ immediately associates *Baptism*, as an integral part, with the *Making of disciples;* we seem bound to conclude, that those, who are spoken of as having been *made disciples* from their childhood, had also, as the seal and badge of their discipleship, been in their childhood *baptised:* and, indeed, according to the established opinion of the Early Church, they would not, until after the reception of *Baptism*, be accounted and denominated *Disciples;* for, Baptism being the door into the Christian Community, the Early Church reckoned none, until after Baptism, to be, properly and technically speaking, her acknowledged and enrolled and accredited members.

does not directly *sanction* Prayer for the Dead, she at least no where *condemns* it.

But this is mistake. The *entire* practice, whether *associated* or *not associated* with the doctrine of Purgatory, is explicitly, on *its own proper demerits*, condemned by the Anglican Church in the conclusion of the third part of her Homily concerning Prayer. Hence the adoption of Dr. Brett's proposal would have been an act of self-contradiction. In truth, I may fairly add: that, on the part of the Anglican Church, the very *rejection* of Prayer for the Dead, after it had once been *introduced* into King Edward's Liturgy, is *itself* tantamount to a condemnation; nor can I perceive, how the case is altered by the allegation, that it was rejected at the instance of Bucer and Peter Martyr. The fact still is: Prayer for the Dead *was* rejected, *after* it had been received.

Thus, I apprehend, the present passage sufficiently establishes the existence of the practice of Infant-Baptism, when Justin wrote his first Apology.

2. But, in truth, it does more.

The individuals, noticed by Justin, had been *made disciples* to Christ, and consequently had been *baptised* according to his ordinance, from their very childhood.

But, at the time when he was writing the Work where he incidentally mentions the circumstance, many of them, he says, were Sexagenarians and even Septuagenarians.

That Work, however, his first Apology to wit, is commonly pronounced to have been written about the middle of the second century.

Therefore the Sexagenarians and the Septuagenarians, who had been made disciples from their very childhood, must, by Justin's account of them, have been severally baptised about the year 90 and the year 80.

Consequently, they must have been baptised, while at least the Apostle John was living: and thence, we may reasonably conclude, they must, though Infants, have been baptised, under apostolic sanction and by apostolic authority.

II. The justice of this conclusion is established by the testimony of Irenèus: who, during a considerable part of his life, was the contemporary of Justin; and who, from his migration out of Asia

into Gaul, was familiarly acquainted with the standing practice of the Church both in the East and in the West.

Our Lord, says he, *came to save all through himself: all, that is, who through him are born again unto God; Infants, and Children, and Boys, and Youths, and Adults. Therefore he passed through every age: among Infants being made an Infant, thus sanctifying Infants; among Children being made a Child, thus sanctifying Children, and at the same time becoming to them an example of piety and righteousness and subjection; among Youths being made a Youth, thus becoming an example to Youths, and sanctifying them to the Lord; finally, among Adults being made an Adult, that among all he might be a perfect Master* *.

In this passage, the Sacrament of Baptism is not precisely mentioned: but it is clearly implied, both in the expression *born again* and in the term *sanctifying*. For, as we learned from Justin, Baptism was deemed the ordinary and official channel of Regeneration: and Personal Sanctification was

* Omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare: omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum; infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem: et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes; in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatem, simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus et justitiæ et subjectionis; juvenibus juvenis, exemplum juvenibus fiens et sanctificans Domino; sic et senior in senioribus, ut sit perfectus magister in omnibus. Iren. adv. hær. lib. ii. c. 39. p. 137.

held to be its special characteristic and result. Now *all*, we see, from Infants and Children to Youths and Adults, were believed to be born again, in the Church, through Christ unto God. Therefore *all*, whether Infants or Children or Youths or Adults, must have been alike required to receive Baptism as the mean and sign of Regeneration.

III. The testimony of Tertullian, who, in all the earlier part of his life, was the contemporary of Irenèus, and who flourished only about some forty years later than the martyrdom of Justin, immediately and directly, without any need of deductive reasoning, establishes, as a familiar fact, the practice of Infant-Baptism associated with the requisition of Sponsors.

According to the condition and the situation and also the age of each person, the deferring of Baptism is more useful: but this remark particularly applies to the case of Infants. For why need any danger be incurred by their Sponsors, who themselves, by reason of death, may be unable to fulfil their baptismal promises, or who may find themselves deceived by the future development of a bad disposition in their charge. The Lord, indeed, says: Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not. Let them come, therefore, while they are young: let them come while they are learning: let them come, when they have been taught whither they are going. Let them be made

Christians, when they are capable of knowing Christ *.

Here, we may observe, Tertullian mentions conjointly, as alike prevalent in the Church, the Baptism of Infants and the Baptism of Adults. In each case, he recommends the deferring of the Sacrament. But this expression of his own private opinion, so far from throwing any suspicion upon the *fact* of Primeval Infant-Baptism, does, in truth, by the very circumstance of its occurrence, the more effectually establish it: for no such opinion could ever have been given, had not the practice itself been familiar and universal. Whatever we may think of Tertullian's *opinion*, there is no ambiguity in his *testimony*.

IV. Our chain of evidence is carried onward by Cyprian, who flourished about forty or fifty years later than Tertullian.

If any thing could impede men in the attainment of grace: sins of a grievous description might impede the Adult and the Aged. If, then, the remission of sins be granted, upon their subsequent belief,

* Itaque, pro cujusque personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio Baptismi utilior: præcipuè tamen circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est, sponsores etiam periculo ingeri, qui et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, et proventu malæ indolis falli? Ait quidem Dominus: *Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire.* Veniant, ergo, dum adolescunt: veniant, dum discunt; dum, quo veniant, docentur. Fiant Christiani, quum Christum nosse potuerint. Tertull. de Baptism. Oper. p. 710.

even to the most grievous offenders ; and if no one be prohibited from Baptism and Grace : how much less ought an Infant to be prohibited ; who having been but recently born, has not sinned, except only so far as he has contracted the contagion of primeval death from his first nativity, being carnally born according to the image of Adam *.

V. With such attestations before us, we may fairly add : that the practice of Infant-Baptism is *insinuated* by Clement of Rome, though not specifically *mentioned*.

He cites Job, as saying : that *No one is pure from sinful corruption, even though his age may not exceed a single day* †.

Now Baptism was held to wash away the stain and penalty of Original Sin : and, under this aspect, it was, as we have seen, administered in the Early Church to Infants. Clement, there-

* Ceterum, si homines impedire aliquid, ad consecutionem gratiæ, posset : magis adultos et provectos et majores natu possent impedire peccata graviora. Porro autem, si etiam gravissimis delictoribus et in Deum multum ante peccantibus, cum postea crediderint, remissa peccatorum datur, et baptismo atque a gratia nemo prohibetur : quanto majis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod, secundum Adam carnaliter natus, contagium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit ? Cyprian. Epist. lxiv. Oper. vol. ii. p. 161.

† Ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ κατηγορῶν εἶπεν· Οὐδεὶς καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου, ἐὰν καὶ μιᾶς ἡμέρας ᾖ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ. Clem. Rom. Epist. ad Corinth. i. § 17.

fore, in avowing the existence of Original Sin, even in Babes of a day old, plainly leaves us to infer, that, in their case, the divinely prescribed remedy was not neglected and pretermitted: and the propriety of such an inference is fully established by collateral and successive testimony. I may remark indeed, in the way of direct corroboration, that from the precise text adduced by Clement, Jerome argues onward to the necessity of Baptism and Regeneration, exactly as I infer Clement and the Church of his day to have argued.

Spiritual Generation needs the Salutary Washing: for No one is clean from filth, even though he has lived but a single day *.

VI. The concurrent evidence of these several ancient Fathers, both in the East and in the West and in the South, establishes the Historical Fact: that, *From the days of the Apostles, Infant-Baptism was the universally received practice of the Catholic Church in every part of the world.*

* Generatio spiritualis lavacro indiget salutari. *Nullus enim mundus a sorde, nec si unius quidem dici fuerit vita ejus.* Hieron. Comment. in Ezech. xvi. 4. Oper. vol. iv. p. 368.

CHAPTER II.

CONFLICTING ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF THE ABSOLUTE INSEPARABILITY OF OUTWARD BAPTISM AND MORAL REGENERATION IN THE CASE OF INFANT-RECIPIENTS.

Since Baptism is administered to Infants in the Christian Church, just as Circumcision was administered to Infants also in the Levitical Church; and since, moreover, Infants are personally placed in a situation widely different from that of Adults who have attained to years of discretion: a question, respecting the Moral Effect of Infant-Baptism, must inevitably, from the very first, have forced itself upon the attention of Theologians.

Whatever may have been the sentiments of Antiquity, it is certain, that the sentiments of Modern Divines differ, on this question, very widely and very essentially.

Before I proceed, therefore, to an examination of Antiquity, I shall notice and (I trust) impar-

tially discuss the arguments which are severally brought forward: both by those, who, in the case of Infant Recipients, *maintain* the Absolute Inseparability of Outward Baptism and Inward Moral Regeneration; and by those, who, likewise in the case of Infant-Recipients, *deny* the existence of any such Absolute Inseparability.

The arguments of those, who, in the case of Infant-Recipients, *maintain* the Absolute Inseparability of Outward Baptism and Moral Regeneration, shall first be examined *.

* Writers, who take this view of the question, very commonly describe themselves, as advocating what they denominate the *Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.*

I certainly must protest against the distinctive adoption of such phraseology, as being controversially unfair and sophistical: just as the importunate claim of the title of *Catholics* by members of the Roman Church, and as the analogous importunate claim of the title of *Unitarians* by our modern Impugners of the Doctrine of the Trinity, are precisely in the same manner, *also* unfair and sophistical.

In each case *alike*, a style and title are assumed, as being *specially* and *exclusively* descriptive of the theological character of the assumers: while, in truth, they are nothing of the sort.

Romanists are *Catholics*: not, however, because they are members of the Roman Church; but because they are members, though lamentably diseased, of the Universal Church of Christ. That is to say, they are *Catholics*: though not, as their offensive mode of assuming the name is designed to intimate, Catholics *exclusively*.

In like manner, Antitrinitarians are *Unitarians*: not, how-

I. One of these arguments is often popularly stated to the following effect.

Since Christ himself associated together, as one complex act, Regeneration through Water and Regeneration from the Spirit: it is presumptuous, in vainly speculative man, to disjoin them. But, if they must not be disjoined: then the Moral Regeneration of Infants will attend invariably upon their Outward Baptism.

To this argument, it is easily replied: both that *It sets Scripture in opposition to Scripture;* and that, *By proving too much, it suicidally proves nothing.*

ever, because they deny the Doctrine of the Trinity, but because they assert the Doctrine of the Unity. That is to say, they are *Unitarians:* though not as their equally offensive mode of assuming the name is similarly designed to intimate, Unitarians *exclusively;* for their opponents assert the Unity of the Godhead quite as strenuously as they can do.

Now, just after the same fashion, those, who *specially* and *contradistinctively* claim to advocate the *Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration*, are, in point of ideality, altogether inaccurate: because their claim is so put as to imply, that their opponents *reject* the *Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.*

This, however, is not the case. What is denied is, not the *Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration* SIMPLY, but the *Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration* INVARIABLY. Their opponents say not; that *Infants are* NEVER *regenerated in Baptism:* which would be a *rejection* of the *Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.* But they doubt; *Whether Infants be* ALWAYS *regenerated in Baptism:* which is only a *modification* and *limitation* of the Doctrine.

1. It sets Scripture in opposition to Scripture.

Our Lord, no doubt, determines Baptism by Water to be *one* mean of Moral Regeneration: but he does not, therefore, determine it to be the *sole* mean. For, if we rapidly assert, that such was his *exclusive* determination: then we place his three inspired Apostles, James and Peter and John, in direct contradiction to him; inasmuch as they have severally proposed *two* other means, through which Moral Regeneration is by the Holy Spirit communicated.

2. It, furthermore, by proving too much, suicidally proves nothing.

If the argument proves any thing, it will prove that Outward Baptism and Inward Regeneration are *absolutely* inseparable. But, by those who employ the argument, *strictly absolute* Inseparability is not pretended: for they admit, that Baptism does not work *ex opere operato;* and thence they admit, that, in the case of profane or infidel Recipients, Inward Regeneration does *not* attend upon Outward Baptism. Hence, by those who give up the point of *absolute* Inseparability, the present argument cannot be used without a gross paralogism.

II. Conceding, then, the point of *absolute* Inseparability; as indeed they *must*, on the acknowledged principle that an infidel scorner is *not* morally regenerated by his mere submission to the secretly despised rite of Baptism: they frame,

upon such concession, yet another argument, which is usually, I believe, deemed the very citadel of the System.

If thrown into a syllogism, it will stand in manner following.

Moral Regeneration INVARIABLY *attends upon the due administration of Outward Baptism, where no obstacle of unworthiness or inaptness is opposed by the Recipient. But an Infant-Recipient neither does, nor can, oppose any obstacle of unworthiness or inaptness. Therefore, in the case of Infant-Recipients, Moral Regeneration* INVARIABLY *attends upon the due administration of Outward Baptism* *.

1. Now, on the authority of Cyprian and Augustine and Athanasius and Cyril, an opponent, were he so disposed, might demur even to

* This syllogism, if I rightly understand the matter, is superfluous and useless to those, who advocate the System espoused by Dr. Waterland and Bishop Bethell.

Since they professedly confine the term *Regeneration* to the sense of *A Federal Change of Relative Condition;* and since they would, exclusively and contradistinctively, employ the terms *Conversion* and *Renovation* to express that *Moral Change of Disposition* which (they rightly contend) may take place either before Baptism or in Baptism or after Baptism; ALL, who are baptised, whether worthy or unworthy, *must* so far as I can perceive, according to *this* scheme, be regenerated.

That, agreeably to such definitions, such must inevitably be the case, is abundantly clear.

Baptism, even though unworthily received, must never, on

the first proposition of the syllogism: *Moral Regeneration* INVARIABLY *attends upon the due*

the supposition of the unworthy becoming worthy, be subsequently repeated.

Now *why* must it never be repeated, in the event of the future sincere penitence of an originally unworthy Recipient?

Evidently, because the man, however unworthy, has *already* been regenerated in the sense, to which Dr. Waterland and Bishop Bethell would confine the term *Regeneration*.

Under *this* aspect, as we have seen, Augustine acknowledges the Regeneration of Simon Magus; although, both with him and with sundry other ecclesiastical writers, the sorcerer is the regular stock example of a person, who had been outwardly baptised *without* being morally regenerated or morally changed in mind and disposition.

Etenim Simonem Magum, per baptisma, ipsa (scil. Ecclesia) PEPERERAT: cui tamen dictum est, quod non haberet partem in hæreditate Christi. Nunquid ei baptismus, nunquid evangelium, nunquid sacramenta, defuerunt? Sed, quia ei charitas defuit, FRUSTRA NATUS EST. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. i. c. 10. Oper. vol. vii. p. 33.

In the sense advocated by the Bishop and Dr. Waterland, Augustine, we see, denies not that even Simon *was* born again in Baptism: he contents himself with saying, that he was born again to *no moral or beneficial purpose*. Indeed, from Regeneration, if *thus* limited in its import to a mere *Federal Change of Relative Condition*, I do not perceive, how a baptised man can be excluded by *any* unworthy recipiency of Baptism. No *Moral* Change is implied: and, like Simon Magus, as his case is stated by Augustine, he is simply, through the medium of a particular ceremony, admitted to what may be called the *Freedom of the Christian Corporation*. He has been matriculated, and his name stands upon the books. Hence he is an enrolled member of the great Ecclesiastical University. But,

administration of Outward Baptism, where no obstacle of unworthiness or inaptness is opposed by the Recipient.

In attesting the doctrine of the Early Church, all these ancient Fathers declare: that Regeneration may be attained *without* Baptism, though not when Baptism is *despised.* Let us suppose, then, that an Infant, like one of the Holy Innocents who were slaughtered by Herod and who from the beginning have always been deemed glorified Martyrs of Christ, has been regenerated *without* and *before* Baptism. In such a supposed case, since the universal judgment of the Early Church, rightly and in strict consistence with the necessity of the metaphor, denied the possibility of *two* Regenerations: the Infant, by the hypothesis, having been *already* regenerated, clearly could not be *again* regenerated even by the most correct administration of Outward Baptism.

2. But the supposed opponent of the present System shall rather confine himself to the second proposition: *An Infant-Recipient neither does, nor can, present any obstacle of unworthiness or inaptness.*

This proposition has been stated, again and again, with as much confidence, as if any contradiction were a physical impossibility. Yet, unless

neither to himself nor to his Alma Mater, is he either useful or ornamental. He has acquired privileges, indeed: but he makes no beneficial use of them.

it be established by some tangible proof, it is nothing more respectable than a mere begging of the question.

Where, then, is the *proof?* How *know* we, that Infant-Recipients neither do, nor can, present any obstacle of unworthiness or inaptness?

Scripture teaches us; that *Man is shapen in iniquity, and in sin did his mother conceive him,* so that *foolishness is even bound in the heart of a child:* and the Anglican Church faithfully reëchoing Scripture, assures us; that *We are all born in sin, and the children of wrath.* Under this aspect, absolutely and intrinsecally, NO ONE, born of woman, can be an apt and worthy Recipient of Baptism: unless we rebut the negative, by paradoxically asserting; that the same individual, at the same moment of time, may be, at once, apt and inapt, worthy and unworthy. Clearly, unless we run into rank Pelagianism, and contend that *man can* TURN *and* PREPARE *himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God,* we must admit: that, in order to *become* an apt and worthy Recipient of Baptism, fallen and apostate man must experience a *turning* and *preparatory* act of the Spirit of Grace, analogous, when we carry on the metaphor employed by our Lord in his discourse with Nicodemus, to the quickening of a child within the womb *anterior* and *preparatory* to his natural

birth *. But this *turning* and *preparation*, by the very terms of the case, are, to an Infant, no less intrinsecally necessary, than to an Adult. Hence, unless we run headlong into the heresy of Pelagius (which heresy, as Augustine most justly argues, is practically confuted by the very bringing of Infants to Baptism†), we must admit: that *no* Infant can be an apt and worthy Recipient,

* See above, book ii. chap. 5. § II. note.

† Cernis, quemadmodum circumcisionem circumcisioni, comminationem comminationi, vir, ecclesiastica doctrina præditus (scil. Cyprianus), comparavit. Quod ergo est *octavo die non circumcidi*, hoc est, *in Christo non baptizari:* et, quod est *perire de populo suo*, hoc est, *non intrare in regnum cœlorum*. Et tamen vos (Pelagiani), in baptismate parvulorum, expoliationem carnis, hoc est, Circumcisionem non manu factam, celebrari negatis, cum nihil eos, quo expoliari debeant, habere contenditis. Non enim eos fatemini mortuos in præputio carnis suæ, quo peccatum significatur, maximè quod originaliter trahitur: per hoc enim est corpus nostrum corpus peccati, quod evacuari dicit Apostolus per crucem Christi. August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. ii. c. 6. Oper. vol. vii. p. 339.

Sed certè vos (Pelagiani), qui miseram falsa defensione premitis et perniciosa laude oppugnatis infantiam, quare, nihil mali merentes, tot in parvulis imagines Dei, si non baptizentur, non admittitis ad regnum Dei? Ibid. lib. iii. c. 12. p. 349.

The argument is perfect, in the establishment of the doctrine of Original Sin: but then, by plain necessity, it is equally perfect, in the establishment of the *natural* unworthiness or inaptness of *all* Infants to receive Baptism.

It strikes me, that the matter lies within very narrow limits.

If we maintain, that *all* Infants, *as* Infants, are worthy Recipients of Baptism, because they place no obstacle in the

unless, by a *preparatory* act of inscrutable grace, he shall have first been *made* so; and, consequently, that *every* Infant, unless by such *preparatory* act of grace he shall have been *made* an apt and worthy Recipient, absolutely, *as* an infant born in sin, presents that precise obstacle which it has been incautiously asserted he *could not* present.

The question, therefore, will finally resolve itself into this: *Whether God, invariably or not invariably, by a* PREPARATORY *act of grace,* CAUSES *Infants to be, what they otherwise would not be, apt and worthy Recipients of Baptism.* For, upon the antecedent solution of *this* question, will hang the solution of the dependent question: *Whether Infants, in Baptism, are, or are not, invariably regenerated.*

way of its beneficial effect: then, by no long train of consequences, we are brought to deny Original Sin; and thus appear in the character of avowed Pelagians.

But, if we strenuously oppose the charge of Pelagianism; and declare our full orthodox belief, that all are born in Original Sin, or (as our Church soundly, though strongly expresses it) that all are *by nature born in sin and the children of wrath:* then we contradict ourselves, if we assert, that these acknowledged children of wrath, *as* children of wrath, are, nevertheless, apt and worthy Recipients of Baptism.

I have not skill to perceive, how an *unworthy* child of wrath can be a *worthy* Recipient of Baptism, unless some *preparatory* act of spiritual grace take place in his soul. The unworthy must be *made* worthy: otherwise, it is hard to say, how he can *be* worthy.

To settle this matter, we cannot, it is supposed, do better than resort to analogy.

In the Primitive Church, as we have seen, it was a ruled point: that Circumcision, under the Law, was a Sacrament, strictly corresponding with, and designedly typical of, Baptism, under the Gospel; each, under the different names of CIRCUMCISION OF THE HEART and MORAL REGENERATION, mediately conveying, save where an obstacle is opposed, the same INWARD SPIRITUAL GRACE, which, in the very nature of things, is essentially necessary to the possible salvation of our fallen and alienated race.

Let us, then, again throw the argument into a syllogism, framed strictly on the model of the former syllogism: and let us thus see, what will be the result.

Circumcision of the Heart INVARIABLY *attended upon the due administration of Circumcision in the Flesh, when no obstacle of unworthiness or inaptness was opposed by the Recipient. But an Infant-Recipient neither did, nor could, oppose any obstacle of unworthiness or inaptness. Therefore, in the case of Infants, Circumcision of the Heart* INVARIABLY *attended upon the due administration of Circumcision in the Flesh.*

So far, from the premises confidently laid down, we may very logically *argue*. But how is the matter *decided by Scripture?* Truly, though the Jews were *all* circumcised on the eighth day and

thence in their Infancy; for none, save proselytes, were circumcised as Adults: yet, both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, these logically-determined *worthy* Recipients of Circumcision in the Flesh are declared, in numerous instances, and those instances themselves upon a large scale, to have *never* received the Circumcision of the Heart *.

Thus, apparently, the favourite argument, from *The Inability of Children to offer any obstacle*, rests upon a mere gratuitous assumption: which not only has never been evidentially established; but which has even, through the medium both of Scripture and of necessary Analogy, been shewn to be altogether unfounded †.

* See Levit. xxvi. 41, 42. Deut. x. 16. Deut. xxx. 6. Jerem. iv. 4. Jerem. vi. 10. Jerem. ix. 25, 26. Acts vii. 51. Rom. ii. 28, 29.

† I remember to have seen it alleged by a stout Inseparabilist: that *A Denial of the Universal Regeneration of Infants in Baptism is a virtual Assertion of high Calvinistic Reprobation; because it forthwith produces the question, why some Infants are regenerated in Baptism and thus made capable of eternal happiness, while other infants are not regenerated in Baptism and thus left incapable of eternal happiness.*

The allegation might, with some little shew of reason, be pronounced correct, if it were asserted: that *Children, not regenerated in Baptism, could never hereafter be regenerated through any other channel.* But, so far from any such assertion having ever been made, the very principle of every Separabilist is: that *Children, not regenerated in Baptism, are in no wise precluded from being hereafter regenerated, either through the*

III. The only additional argument, so far as I know, which is brought forward by the advocates

medium of the Revealed Word of God, or through the medium of a Believing Reception of Christ however effected.

In truth, the difficulty, such as it is, lies a step backward. For it may justly be retorted: that *The System of Calvin is quite as much favoured by the opinion of those who hold Baptism and Moral Regeneration to be inseparable only when no obstacle is opposed on the part of the Recipient, as it is by the opinion of those who deny the Universal Regeneration of Infants in Baptism.*

The *real* case, when we ascend to the fountain-head, runs as follows.

On the part of the Inseparabilist, it is not denied, that there *is* such a thing as an *Unworthy Reception of Baptism:* neither is it denied, that, *where* there is an Unworthy Reception of Baptism, *there* is no *Beneficial Concomitance of Moral Regeneration.*

This is not denied. Nor yet again is it denied, for our Inseparabilist is no Pelagian: that *Man, in his own strength and without divine grace, is unable to make himself a Worthy Recipient; inasmuch as all Preparative Worthiness is the sole gift of God.*

Such matters, then, being fully allowed on *each* side, the Theologian, who is charged with inevitably favouring the Calvinistic Doctrine of Reprobation, *because* he denies the Universal Regeneration of Infants in Baptism, may fairly accommodate his accuser with a specimen of the retort courteous.

You ask me, how I escape being a patron of the high Calvinistic Doctrine of Reprobation, inasmuch as I hold: that *some* Infants are regenerated in Baptism and thus made *capable* of eternal happiness; while *other* Infants are not regenerated in Baptism and thus left *incapable* of eternal happiness?

In return, I will put the same question to *yourself*, inasmuch

of the present opinion, is: *The alleged Unanimous Consent of the Ancient Fathers, and, through them, of the Primitive Church, from the very beginning.*

This, again, is commonly urged with as much

as *you* hold: that *some*, like St. Paul, are made Worthy Recipients of Baptism, and are thus *qualified* for eternal happiness; while *others*, like Simon Magus, are not made Worthy Recipients of Baptism, and are thus left *disqualified* for eternal happiness.

You ask me, why, on my principle, *some* Infants are regenerated in Baptism, and *others* are not so regenerated?

In return, I ask you, on our common principle, why *some* Persons are made Worthy Recipients of Baptism, and *others* are not made Worthy Recipients?

Thus may a Separabilist retort upon an Inseparabilist.

In my own judgment, the objection is alike idle on *both* sides. But still it is just as valid on the *one* part, as it is on the *other* part. It is impossible for the Inseparabilist to charge the Separabilist with a hankering after the Doctrine of Reprobation, and yet *himself* escape the equitable retort of precisely the same charge. At least, he most assuredly cannot escape, save through medium of avowing himself a stark Pelagian. On every account both of Sound Logic and of Christian Charity, I regret that the allegation should ever have been adventured. If this discussion of its demerits should prevent its repetition, my labour will not have been in vain. I believe the Calvinistic Scheme of Election and Reprobation quite as little as the alleger could do. But, though I can discover no foundation for Calvinism beyond the Insulated Private Judgment of Augustine at the beginning of the fifth century; a world too late for binding evidence: still, from the respect which I feel for those numerous excellent individuals who are and have been doctrinal Calvinists, I must protest against their System being employed as an *Argumentum ad Invidiam.*

positiveness, as if it could not for a moment be doubted or controverted. Be the allegation, however, well founded, or be it ill founded, at any rate a pure historical FACT is asserted : and, indisputably, before the asserted FACT can be admitted as the basis of an argument, the FACT *itself* must be established by competent evidence.

If any such testimony, in favour of what claims to be the Universally received Doctrine of the Catholic Church from the time of her inspired personal teachers the Apostles, be actually in existence : no reasonable opponent, I should think, who at all understands the nature and value of *Trustworthy Evidence to a* FACT, would hesitate to acknowledge, that his own cause was hopeless, and that the cause of his antagonists was firmly established ; for, in any mere modern of yesterday, it is perfectly vain and idle to set up the unsupported vagaries of his own insulated Private Judgment against the recorded aboriginal testimony of the whole Catholic Church. But, before he submits to an argument professedly built upon a FACT, he requires, not unreasonably, that the FACT, which is *alleged*, be also *substantiated.*

CHAPTER III.

CONFLICTING ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE ABSOLUTE INSEPARABILITY OF OUTWARD BAPTISM AND MORAL REGENERATION IN THE CASE OF INFANT-RECIPIENTS.

The arguments of those, who, in the case of Infant-Recipients, either *doubt* or *deny* the Invariable Concurrence of Outward Baptism and Moral Regeneration, shall next be stated and examined.

I. Of these, the most common, and apparently the most approved, is one, which, like the last-noticed opposing argument, is constructed upon an alleged matter of FACT.

Many, who have been baptised in their Infancy, pass through life, and finally descend into the grave, without giving any token of their having experienced a Moral Regeneration: and some who were also baptised in their Infancy, after being for a season the willing servants of sin, evince at length, clearly

and distinctly, by a total change both of principle and of conduct, their reception of that New Creation or New Birth from above, without which no man can enter into the kingdom of God. Now these FACTS *could not happen, if Moral Regeneration invariably attended upon Infant-Baptism. Therefore the Doctrine of such Invariable Attendance, being confuted by absolute* FACTS, *cannot possibly be true.*

1. The validity of this argument will be the most effectually tested, if the discussion of it be thrown into the form of a disputation.

(1.) Those, who *maintain* its validity, must, of course, open the question.

In too many notorious cases, say they, baptised Infants grow up without giving practically the least demonstrative sign of Moral Regeneration: for their whole spirit and conduct and language intimate; that, in their hearts, they are utterly alienated from God; and that, both in principle and in the strictly corresponding habituality of wicked works, they are his determined and inveterate enemies.

Some remain in this condition, hardened and insensible and impenitent, to the very end of their lives: while others, through the Revealed Word of God powerfully applied by the Spirit to their consciences, and thence through their Believing Reception of Christ the Saviour, experience a marvellous Change, both of taste and of purpose

and of practice, which is evident indeed to all men, and which they themselves in grateful humility are the first and the most ready to acknowledge.

This great Moral Change we pronounce to be, what in Scripture is styled, variously and indifferently, *Regeneration* or *New Creation* or *Conversion* or *Renovation:* and, since it occurs, not unfrequently, in persons who have undeniably been baptised in their Infancy, we argue from it; that, *In Infant-Baptism, Moral Regeneration and Outward Washing are, by no means, inseparable.*

(2.) To this statement, formidable as it appears, the favourers of the *opposite* opinion are not unprovided with a reply.

We admit, and bless God for the palpable Moral Change, upon which you build your argument: but we conceive, that you adopt an incorrect nomenclature and a false idea when you denominate it *Regeneration.*

The happy subject of the Moral Change under discussion was, indisputably, regenerated morally in *Baptism.* But, just as a human individual, after his natural birth, may speedily fall into a sickness, which disturbs all the functions of physical life, which may even suspend life in a state of comatose insensibility, and which may bring the patient to the very gates of death; while yet, nevertheless, he may completely recover from this dangerous sickness, and may afterward become a

stout and healthy man: so likewise, in strict accordance with the metaphor, may one, who has been spiritually born again in his Infant-Baptism, fall into the apparently mortal sickness of complete lethargic insensibility and of thorough alienation and of utter profligacy; while yet, by God's blessing and gracious influence, he may afterward entirely recover from his malady, and become a healthy and devout and consistent servant of the Lord.

What you, then, erroneously call *Regeneration*, making it the absolute commencement of the new life: you ought rather to call *Restoration*, viewing it only in the light of a recovery from severe moral sickness. For, just as you would never think of saying; that a person, who had recovered from a very serious physical malady, was then, for the first time, *born* from the womb of his natural mother: so neither, unless you be determined to violate the whole propriety of the metaphor, ought you to say; that a reclaimed worldling or a restored profligate or an awakened insensible, each of whom had been baptised in his Infancy, was then, in the day of his moral recovery, for the first time, spiritually *born again*.

2. The whole of this seems very fair and plausible: but the dispute is not therefore concluded.

(1.) Those, who *defend* the argument before us, will be at no loss for a speedy rejoinder.

What you say, might hold good, if the person

in question had *ever* evinced any serious thoughts of religion, and had then *afterward* fallen away from a manifest state of grace: as was the case with David, for instance, when he lapsed from the holy service of God, to the associated deadly sins of murder and adultery.

But *our* instances are of a *totally different* character. From the time of their Baptism in Infancy, to the time of what *we* call their *Regeneration*, the men, of whom *we* are speaking, had *never* been really and spiritually influenced by religion. They had *never* exhibited any of St. John's distinctly specified badges or tokens or characteristics of the new-born children of God. They had *not* ceased to be under the habitual and allowed and loved dominion of sin: they had *no* love of the brethren, *as* the brethren, whatever mere *general* philanthropy they might display; nay rather, *as* the brethren, they internally hated and often openly ridiculed the brethren: they had, *in no practical manner*, whatever might be their purely traditional and altogether uninfluential theory, believed from the heart that Jesus is the Christ: they had, *in no wise*, at any season of their *previous* life, overcome the world; but, rather, the world had too plainly overcome them*.

Hence, consistently with the statements of the Apostle, we cannot deem those to have been

* 1 John iii. 9. iv. 7. v. 1—4, 18.

already regenerated in Baptism, while yet Infants; who, during the whole period of their subsequent existence down to the time of a mighty Moral Change perceived and acknowledged by all men, *bore not a single badge* of Spiritual Regeneration.

(2.) To such a rejoinder, the favourers of the *opposite* opinion will readily give an answer, no wise inferior in point of plausibility.

Your argument, from the statements of St. John, might be valid: were you, through inspiration, qualified to apply them infallibly to any particular person or persons.

We admit, that they characterise, but too accurately, many baptised individuals: yet we conceive, that this does not exactly establish the point for which you contend.

Your argument runs: that *These persons, when brought to a saving sense of religion, cannot justly be said to have been only* RESTORED *to their original baptismal state of infused holiness: because this imports, that they had fallen* FROM *a state of grace; whereas, in truth, they never were* IN *a state of grace.*

Thus runs your argument.

Now, by the very use of such an argument, you virtually claim a degree of knowledge, which neither you, nor even the restored persons themselves, possess.

Will you pretend confidently to say: that pre-

vious to this happy Moral Change from evil to good, they had *no* compunctious visitings, *no* feelings of remorse, *no* purposes (however, for a season, unavailing) of amendment? Nay, will the very subjects of the Moral Change themselves, deliberately and after full recollection, assert: that *never*, so far as their memories can look backward, had they the slightest sorrow for sin, the slightest wish to be reconciled to God, the slightest purpose some time or other to receive Christ as their Saviour, the slightest anxious desire of ceasing from evil and of attaining heaven?

Scarcely, we think, will these questions be answered in the affirmative: nay, verily, a truly pious man, a prophet of your own, who was the subject of one of the most remarkable Moral Changes upon record, has answered them, with special reference to himself, in the negative *.

* I allude to the late Mr. Newton, whose autobiography forms the basis of a memoir of him by the late Mr. Cecil.

Mr. Newton states: that his mother was a pious woman, who made it the chief business and pleasure of her life to instruct him and to bring him up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Afterward, when a mere boy, going to sea, his sinful propensities gathered strength by habit: and, even at that unripe age, he became very wicked. Still, however, the early precepts of his parent, aided no doubt by her prayers (after the manner of the venerable Monica, the holy mother of Augustine), were not forgotten. At the age of about fifteen years, he assures us, what may readily be credited, that he was often disturbed with religious convictions: insomuch that he

If so, what right have you positively to say: that, in these secret cogitations of the erring heart, the good Spirit of God was not striving with individuals, regenerated indeed through their Bap-

began statedly to pray, to read the Scriptures, to keep a diary, and to think himself religious. But he soon became weary of such practices: and gave them up. Then, a docile scholar, he learned to curse and to blaspheme: and, though at so early a period, became exceedingly depraved. A severe accident next alarmed him; which, for a time put him upon breaking off his profane habits: but, as Mr. Cecil expresses it, *the consequence of these struggles between sin and conscience was, that, on every relapse, he sunk into still greater depths of wickedness.* Next, he was roused by the death of a companion, who perished by drowning, while his own life was saved by his providentially not being of the party. The perusal of the *Family Instructor* produced another temporary reformation. In short, from his own recorded testimony, Mr. Cecil assures us: that *he took up, and laid aside, a religious profession, three or four different times, before he was sixteen years of age.*

But it may not be useless, for the purpose of this investigation, to let Mr. Newton speak in his own person.

All this while, says he, *my heart was insincere. I often saw the necessity of religion, as a mean of escaping hell: but I loved sin, and was unwilling to forsake it. I was so strangely blind and stupid, that, sometimes, when I have been determined upon things which I knew were sinful, I could not go on quietly till I had first dispatched my ordinary task of prayer, in which I have grudged every moment of the time. When this was finished, my conscience was in some measure pacified: and I could rush into folly with little remorse.*

It is superfluous to add much more to the same purpose. I pass on to the time, when Mr. Newton's ebbing and flowing

tism in Infancy, but unhappily fallen into a state of very dangerous spiritual sickness?

Whether your opinion, in the abstract, be true or false, you can build no legitimate doctrinal

religious impressions finally assumed that fixedness which continued to the end of his life.

He himself describes the circumstance in manner following.

But now the Lord's time was come: and the conviction, that I was so unwilling to receive, was deeply impressed upon me by an awful dispensation.

Between the holders of opposite opinions, touching the Separability or Inseparability of Moral Regeneration and Infant-Baptism, the question upon the case of Mr. Newton, I suppose, will be: *Whether these various antecedent tendencies to religion, before he finally became a firm and established Christian, were merely the workings of the natural conscience upon early-received theological head-knowledge;* or *Whether they were indications, that the New Spiritual Life, imparted to him, as* (by the hypothesis) *to every baptised Infant, at the time of his Baptism, was not extinct, but still, however faintly and defectively, indicated signs both of actual existence and of final restoration to lost moral health.*

Mr. Newton himself evidently inclined to the *former* opinion: for he states, that, in his earlier seasons of a temporary adoption of religious profession, his *heart was insincere.* If so, though he had received Baptism in his infancy, he would want what Augustine calls *Conversio cordis:* that *Conversion of the heart,* to wit; which (in his theology) must be experienced, in order to salvation, by all Infants, at some indefinite time *after* their Baptism; and which, by describing Baptism as being its Sacrament or Outward Visible Sign, he undoubtedly identifies with *Moral Regeneration.* See August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 24, 25. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52, 53. But it may be doubted, whether any man is an absolutely infallible

argument upon a matter *infallibly* known to God alone. In other words, your opinion *may* be correct: but your reasoning, hitherto, has not *proved* it to be correct.

3. Still, however, we are not to imagine, that the dispute is brought to a conclusion.

(1.) The *defenders* of the present argument will soon shew, that they are by no means silenced.

We readily admit the truth of what you say respecting certain workings of the conscience antecedent to that great Moral Change which we call *Regeneration:* but we doubt their applicability to the present matter.

They strike us, as being nothing more than the ordinary workings of the Natural Conscience: workings, which a person would experience no less, even if he had *never* been baptised; and, accordingly, workings, which the very heathens,

judge of his own true internal state. Either in self-absolution, or in self-condemnation, we may tremblingly say with the prophet, *The heart is deceitful above all things.* Mr. Newton's heart *may* have been really insincere: or a subsequent more acute perception of holiness and honesty may have led him to *deem* it altogether insincere, when, in truth, it was only partially and (as we may say in a figure) *diseasedly* so. A mixture of religious insincerity with religious sincerity, arguing a condition not of moral death but only of moral sickness, is by no means impossible, and, I suspect, very far from uncommon. See Cecil's Memoir of the Rev. John Newton. Works, vol. i. p. 227—273.

who knew not Christ, actually record themselves to *have* experienced *.

Thus easily is the first part of your answer settled. Nor shall we find much more difficulty in the remainder.

St. John has given us certain tests or marks, whereby we may judge, whether a person is, or is not, really regenerated. The tests are these.

A morally regenerated individual may be recognised as such: by *doing righteousness* †; by *purifying himself even as God is pure* ‡; by *not habitually and allowedly committing sin* §; by *loving the brethren, as the brethren* ‖; by *a living belief that Jesus is the Christ* ¶; by *a victory over the world, through which it is effectually overcome* **; and by *a diligent keeping of himself, so that the wicked one toucheth him not* ††.

Where these tokens *exist*; there we have a morally regenerated person: where they *do not exist*; there, conversely, we have a person who is not morally regenerated.

Now your mode of reasoning plainly goes to

* Video meliora, proboque: deteriora sequor. Those, who incline to Bp. Bull's interpretation, which makes St. Paul describe the workings of the natural conscience, not of the conscience as renewed and enlightened by grace, might also adduce Rom. vii. 7—25.

† 1 John ii. 29. ‡ 1 John iii. 1—3. § 1 John iii. 9.
‖ 1 John iii. 10—14. iv. 7. ¶ 1 John v. 1.
** 1 John v. 4. †† 1 John v. 18.

stultify the whole of the tests, so distinctly propounded by St. John.

For, on the plea that *Every Infant is morally regenerated in Baptism*, you contend: that an individual, who has been baptised in his Infancy, and who has never shewn any signs of grace unless the mere temporary workings of the Natural Conscience be deemed such, is to be accounted morally regenerate; though he does *no* righteousness; though he does *not* purify himself; though he *does*, habitually and allowedly, commit sin; though he does *not* love the brethren, but, on the contrary, dislikes them, because *their* views and habits are the reverse of *his* views and habits; though he has *no* living and practical belief in Jesus the Messiah; though he has obtained *no* victory over the world, but rather is its willing and obedient vassal; and though he does not diligently keep himself, lest the wicked one should obtain an advantage over him.

If a man, then, merely because he has been baptised in his Infancy, may be alike regenerate, whether he *can*, or *cannot*, shew, in his own person, St. John's specified tokens of Regeneracy: clearly, in such a case, the tokens *cease* to be discriminating tokens; and, thus, the Apostle has written in vain.

But, that he has *not* written in vain, is certain: and *that*, from the very moulding and tenor of his statements.

If, in his inspired judgment, *all*, who had been baptised in Infancy, were thence, *ipso facto*, regenerate: the Reception of Infant-Baptism would *alone* have been urged, as the true and infallible test of a man's Regeneration. St. John *might*, on such a supposition, have defined as he *does* define; in order that a man might practically judge, whether he *remained* in his baptismal state of grace, or whether he had *fallen away* from it: but we see not, how, on such a supposition, he could lay down certain discriminating tokens of the *Reception* or *Non-Reception* of Regeneration *itself*. Yet St. John is totally silent, respecting Baptism either infant or adult: and, in proof of their Regeneracy, he simply refers men to certain *moral* tests, by which they may know, whether they *have* or *have not*, been regenerated. The Apostle, therefore, according to the very tenor of his own statements, must have held: that *Those, who could not abide such moral tests, were, by that precise circumstance, evinced to be still unregenerate.*

In thus arguing from the tests proposed by St. John, we are, in no wise, either hesternal or singular: we do but repeat the ancient accredited reasoning of the Church Catholic, as delivered by Augustine. That Father, in the beginning of the fifth century, argued, from the Apostle's tokens of Regeneration, exactly as we argue.

Behold, says he, *a man, when baptised, has re-*

ceived the Sacrament of his Nativity. He hath a Sacrament, and a great Sacrament, divine, holy, ineffable. Consider what it is: that it should even make a New Man by the remission of all sins. Let him, however, attend to his heart, whether that be there perfected, which has been done in his body. Let him see, whether he has charity: and then let him say, I have been born of God. If he hath it not, he bears indeed a character impressed upon him: but he only wanders about as a deserter. Let him have charity: otherwise, let him not say, that he has been born of God.—Behold the entire drift and purpose of John's circumlocution. Every one, who is born of God, sinneth not: because his seed remaineth in him. *He means the seed of God; that is, the word of God. Hence the Apostle says: I have begotten you through the Gospel.* And he cannot sin, because he hath been born of God. *Let us, then, see, in what he cannot sin.* In this, are manifested the sons of God, and the sons of the Devil. Every one, who is not righteous, is not of God: and he who loveth not his brother. *It is now clearly manifested, why he says:* And he who loveth not his brother. *Love alone constitutes the distinction, between the sons of God, and the sons of the Devil. Let all, as they please, sign themselves with the sign of the cross of Christ; let all answer, Amen; let all sing, Hallelujah; let all be baptised; let all enter the churches; let all build the walls of cathedrals:*

still, the Sons of God, and the Sons of the Devil, are only distinguished from each other by charity. They, who have charity, have been born of God: they, who have not charity, have not been born of God *.

(2.) To this, their *opponents* will be prepared to reply, as follows.

In laying down such tests of Moral Regeneration, St. John spoke only of those persons, who had been baptised when *Adults:* and we readily admit, that an Adult may receive Baptism unworthily, and thus receive only the Outward Visible Sign without receiving also the Inward Spiritual Grace.

To *Adults*, therefore, for the purpose of diligent self-examination, the tests would be essentially necessary: and it would be clear, that, if they could not abide them, they must have received Baptism hypocritically, and thence could not through it have been morally regenerated.

But the same reasoning does not apply to those persons, who had received Baptism in their *Infancy*. In *their* case, the application of St. John's tests might shew, that they had *fallen away* from their Baptismal Regeneration: but it would not, as in the case of those who had received Adult-

* August. in 1 Epist. Joan. Tractat. v. Oper. vol. ix. p. 220. The entire passage, with the latin original in the margin, has already been cited. See above, book ii. chap. 9. § III. 6.

Baptism, demonstrate, that they had *never* been regenerated.

With respect to your adduction of Augustine, so far from being favourable to your cause, the place adduced really brings out the precise result for which *we* contend. Augustine, in the passage which you have alleged, spoke *exclusively* of those, who had received Adult-Baptism. He could not speak of those *also*, who had received Infant-Baptism: because, if he did, he would contradict himself. So far from doubting the *universal* concomitancy of Regeneration upon Infant-Baptism, he roundly maintains, as every theologian knows: that ALL, *who receive Infant-Baptism, receive with it the inseparably associated grace of Regeneration.*

4. Even yet, the dispute will advance another step, ere it finally close.

(1.) The *defenders* of the original argument are not thus easily to be driven off their ground.

You assert, that St. John, in laying down, as a test of Regeneracy or Unregeneracy, his signs of Moral Regeneration, spoke *exclusively* of those who had received Adult-Baptism.

Now, as this is a *purely gratuitous* assertion, so it is an assertion confuted even by the actual *nature* of the test itself.

In laying down the signs of Moral Regeneration, St. John indisputably propounds a *moral* test of Regeneracy. But a *moral* test, by its

very quality and condition of *being* a moral test, must inevitably be a test of *universal* applicability and effectiveness. To say, that *The Apostle's proposed test may demonstrate baptised Adults to have never received Moral Regeneration, while yet the very same test, in the case of baptised Infants, is wholly incapable of effecting the same demonstration*, is something extremely like a contradiction in terms. A *moral* test, *as* a moral test, must be one, by which *all* baptised persons, whether baptised in Infancy or baptised in Mature Age, may determine, whether they have or have not been regenerated. For instance, the *Not having overcome the world*, which is one of the apostolically propounded signs, can, by no conceivable possibility, be a badge of Unregeneracy in *one* baptised person, if, all the while, it be *no* badge of Unregeneracy in *another* baptised person. The test proposed must be, either of *universal* applicability, or of *no* applicability. Hence the bare circumstance of *A moral test of Regeneracy having been propounded by an inspired Apostle* is, even in itself, a positive and invincible proof: that *Moral Regeneration does not, invariably and of necessity, attend upon Outward Baptism, whether such Outward Baptism be Adult-Baptism or Infant-Baptism.*

It may be further remarked: that, by your arbitrary dealing with Holy Writ in the matter of the apostolic test of Regeneracy, you make it

well nigh useless, save during the particular period in which it was composed.

We may safely concede, that, in St. John's time, the bulk of the baptised would be those who had received Baptism when *Adults:* but, when the Church has become universally established in any nation which has adopted the Gospel as its code of Faith and Practice, the very reverse would be the case; for the incalculably great majority of the baptised would then be those who had received Baptism when *Infants*. Now, on your plan of restriction, you make the Apostle's test of Regeneracy or Unregeneracy to be, in the present day, little more than a mere dead letter. The test might be useful when he wrote: but, in Christendom, it has now become obsolete. At present, according to *your* view of the matter, the test of a man's Moral Regeneracy is, not *His victory over the world* or *His love of the brethren* or *His frcedom from habitual sin* or *His practice of Righteousness* or *His believing Reception of Christ* or *His cautious Walk lest the evil one should get an advantage over him*, but, solely and simply and exclusively, the ascertained fact that *He has been duly baptised in his Infancy.* Such dealing with Scripture we hold to be altogether inadmissible: and we reject it accordingly.

As for Augustine, we are perfectly aware, that he maintains the Universal Regeneration of Infants in Baptism: but this circumstance, when sifted

and explained, affects not, in the slightest degree, the passage which we adduce from him.

He contends, indeed, that *All Infants are regenerated in Baptism:* but then, what is not always noted by those who allege this great Latin Father, the *only* Regeneration, which he allows to baptised Infants and of which he even deems them capable, is a *Federal Regeneration* or a *Federal Change of Relative Condition*, by virtue of which they obtain remission of original sin, are brought into covenant with God, and are outwardly removed from the wilderness of the World into the pale of the Visible Church. The Universality of this *Federal Regeneration*, in the case of baptised Infants, we fully hold with Augustine: and thence, with the whole Catholic Church in all ages, we contend, that the rite of Baptism is not to be repeated. But, with respect to *Moral Regeneration* or a *Moral Change of Disposition*, so far from maintaining that *all* Infants receive it at Baptism, Augustine absolutely denies the very possibility of *any* Infants, *while* Infants, receiving it: and the REASON, which he assigns for his denial, is *Their incapability of believing with the heart unto righteousness and of confessing with the mouth unto salvation.* Hence he argues, that, in order to their final acquisition of the kingdom of God, they must, at some *future* time, experience that great Moral Change and Conversion of Heart, which is *never* communicated to them in Baptism,

though Baptism is the Mystery or Sacrament or Outward Sign of such Moral Regeneration *.

Thus his two statements, so far from contradicting each other, are found perfectly to harmonise.

You claim, says he, *to have received the Sacrament of Baptism. True: but this does not demonstrate your Moral Regeneration. St. John has given you a test of your Regeneracy or your Unregeneracy. Examine, therefore, and see, whether, in your inward principles and your outward conversation, you exhibit the signs and tokens of Moral Regeneration which have been specified by the Apostle. In Baptism, which you received when an Infant, you have indeed been federally regenerated: but, with regard to Moral Regeneration or what I call Conversion of Heart, the whole matter may be stated in a single sentence. They, who have charity, have been born of God: and they, who have it not, have not been born of God* †.

* See August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 23, 24, 25. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52, 53. I have been here compelled, by the course of the discussion, to anticipate. The matter will be taken up again, book iii. chap. 4, when I come to treat of the evidence from Antiquity.

† Archbishop Tillotson, in a manner very similar to that of Augustine, brings the question of a man's Regeneracy or Unregeneracy to a purely *moral* test.

The prevalency and dominion of sin makes an Unregenerate state, as the prevalency of Grace puts a man into a Regenerate State. Serm. cvii. vol. vi. p. 345.

On what principle, the language of St. John, in his first

(2.) I have honestly endeavoured to state, with what force I am able, the reasonings on *both* sides of the question: and, in the regular course of alternation, I have been led to this last exposition of those, who *deny* the Invariable Concomitancy of Moral Regeneration upon Outward Baptism in the case of baptised Infants.

If either I were acquainted with any answer which has actually been given to it, or if I were myself able to construct an answer to it, I would here, in all fairness and good faith, duly propound it: for my sole object, as it has been the object of my entire life, is the ascertainment of truth. But, as I am alike ignorant of the existence of any such answer and unable of my own skill to frame one myself, I am constrained, at the present point of the discussion, to remain silent. If any one can supply my deficiency by successfully giving a final rejoinder, he is at full liberty to take up the theological gauntlet.

II. So much for the first argument: but the maintainers of the Separability of Outward Baptism and Moral Regeneration in the case of Infants, as taught of old by Augustine on the avowed plea, that, *Although not formally defined and ruled*

Epistle, can be interpreted otherwise than as propounding a *moral* test of Regeneracy or Unregeneracy: I confess myself unable to comprehend. So it was understood by Augustine of old: and so, very evidently, it was understood by Archbishop Tillotson in more modern times.

by a General Council, it is notoriously the doctrine of the Catholic Church from the beginning, have yet a second argument to produce of the same tendency. It shall here be duly given: and, as I confess myself unable to offer any final confutation of their first argument when the discussion has passed through all its controversial stages; so this second argument, except by a most dangerous and evidentially destructive expedient, can scarcely, I think, be met and overturned.

In the unanimous judgment of the Primitive Church, Circumcision under the Law was a Sacrament of the very same import and of the very same moral intention, as Baptism under the Gospel. Whence, with great reason (though, as Cyprian justly remarked, it were mere bootless superstition to confine the administration of Baptism to the eighth day, BECAUSE *the eighth day had been definitely appointed for the administration of Circumcision*),*

* Quantum vero ad causam infantium pertinet, quos dixisti intra secundum vel tertium diem, quo nati sint, constitutos, baptizari non oportere; et considerandam esse legem Circumcisionis antiquæ, ut, intra octavum diem, eum, qui natus est, baptizandum et sanctificandum non putares: longè aliud, in Concilio nostro, omnibus visum est. In hoc enim, quod tu putabas esse faciendum, nemo consensit: sed universi potius judicavimus, nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei et gratiam denegandam. Cyprian. Epist. lxiv. Oper. vol. ii. p. 158—160.

Such a question could never have arisen, unless Circumcision had been deemed morally and significantly identical with Bap-

the Circumcision of Infants has always been argumentatively employed to demonstrate the analogical propriety of the Baptism of Infants. Now Infants, as Scripture distinctly attests, might be outwardly circumcised in the Flesh, WITHOUT *being inwardly circumcised in the Heart. Therefore, under the premises of the case, it seems undeniably to follow: that Infants may be outwardly baptised in Water* WITHOUT *being inwardly regenerated by the Spirit.*

I do not myself see, how this argument can be answered, save by a broad *denial* that Circumcision is morally identical with Baptism.

Hence, apparently, perceiving and anticipating the use which might and would be made of the relationship, some warm sticklers for the Absolute Inseparability of Infant-Baptism and Moral Regeneration, have boldly cut the Gordian knot by *denying* the relationship altogether.

But this is a very dangerous and a very inconvenient mode of proceeding.

1. As attested by Augustine and Chrysostom and Athanasius and Cyprian and Justin, probably also by many other witnesses if a person should take the trouble to push the examination further,

tism. Accordingly, the determination of the Council rests, not upon a broad disclaimer of their mutual sacramental connection, but upon the entirely different ground, that, not even for so short a space as seven days, ought, under the mild liberality of the Christian Dispensation, the mercy and grace of God to be denied to any one born of man.

the relationship in question is a ruled and adjudged point in the Primitive Church *.

Consequently, they, who, on the strength of their own Insulated Private Judgment, seek to deliver themselves from a difficulty by *denying* such relationship: that is to say, by *denying* that the Inward Grace of Circumcision or the *Moral Renovation of the Heart* is spiritually identical with the Inward Grace of Baptism or the *Moral Regeneration of the Soul:* these persons, by every just law of reasoning, effectually preclude themselves from ever again appealing to the testimony of the Ancients for the purpose of settling evidentially the true sense of Doctrinal Scripture.

2. Not thus, however, theologised the wise and cautious Reformers of the Church of England.

Agreeably to the plan, as accurately laid down by Bishop Jewel, of resorting to Antiquity, not only for the settlement of Doctrine in general, but likewise for the Ideality and Administration of the Sacraments in particular †: Dean Nowel,

* See above, book ii. chap. 3. § II. 1.

† Accessimus, quantum maximè potuimus, ad Ecclesiam Apostolorum et veterum Catholicorum Episcoporum et Patrum: —nec tantum doctrinam nostram, sed etiam sacramenta, precumque publicarum formam, ad illorum ritus et instituta direximus. — Inde enim putavimus instaurationem petendam esse, unde prima Religionis initia ducta essent. Juell. Apol. Eccles. Anglican. in Enchir. Theolog. vol. i. p. 323.

An excellent Translation of this very important Work of Bishop Jewel has been recently published, with Messrs. Seeley,

in his Catechism, which had the express sanction of Convocation, and which therefore may be said to stand upon the same footing of authority as the Articles and Homilies of the Anglican Church, distinctly asserts that precise relationship of Circumcision and Baptism which was always maintained in the Primitive Church Catholic; while, in strict conformity, the Anglican Church herself has provided a prayer for the true Circumcision of the Spirit, or for that identical Inward Spiritual Grace, of which, Circumcision, like Baptism, was the Outward Visible Sign *.

by my friend Mr. W. Ewbank. Nothing can be more seasonable: for, in, such times as the present, the Apology ought to be in the hands of every Churchman. The execution of the Translation, which is offered in a beautiful little pocket volume, is highly creditable to the skill and taste of Mr. Ewbank.

* Unde nobis constabit, infantes a Baptismo arcendos non esse?

Quum Deus, qui nunquam a veritate deflectit, neque a recta via usquam declinat, infantes in Ecclesia Judaica a Circumcisione non excluserit: neque nostri infantes a Baptismo repellendi sunt.

Itane similia ista, eandemque utrisque causam atque rationem subesse putas?

Omnino. Nam Circumcisionem Pœnitentiæ signum fuisse, ut Moses et Prophetæ omnes testantur, ita divus Paulus eam Fidei Sacramentum esse docet. Nihilominus tamen pueri Judaici, Fidei adhuc et Pœnitentiæ per ætatem minimè capaces, circumcidebantur: quo aspectabili signo, Deus patrem se parvulorum et seminis populi sui esse, in Veteri Testamento ostendebat. Quum vero constet, Dei gratiam et abundantius in

To all, therefore, who have been catechetically instituted, and who afterward associate together for the purpose of public worship, within the pale of her venerable and venerated Communion : to all these, the holding of the Sacramental Relationship of Circumcision and Baptism is a matter propounded by the Church of England, on the

nos effusam et luculentius declaratam in Evangelio per Christum esse, quam olim in Veteri Testamento per Mosen fuerat : indignum foret, si ea vel obscurior, vel aliqua ex parte imminuta, videretur. Noell. Catech. par. iv. in Enchir. Theolog. vol. ii. p. 216, 217.

Grant us the true Circumcision of the Spirit. Collect for the Circumcis. of Christ.

To the same purpose also, harmoniously speaks the Homily.

St. Augustine alloweth the common description of a Sacrament : which is, that *It is a visible sign of an invisible grace* ; that is to say, *That setteth out to the eyes and other outward senses the inward working of God's free mercy, and doth, as it were, seal in our hearts the promises of God.* And so was Circumcision a Sacrament : which preached unto the outward senses the *Inward Cutting away of the Foreskin of the Heart,* and sealed and made sure in the hearts of the circumcised the promise of God touching the promised Seed that they looked for. Homil. of Common Prayer and Sacram. Homil. p. 296, 297. Oxon.

From this statement nothing can be more clear, than that, in the judgment of the Anglican Church, the Inward Grace of Circumcision under the Law, and the Inward Grace of Baptism under the Gospel, are identical. They are alike that *Moral Change of Heart and Disposition,* which we denominate *Regeneration* or *Conversion* or *Renovation* or *New Creation.*

recorded authority of her predecessor and studied exemplar the Primitive Church Catholic.

3. In truth, the essential necessity of a *Moral Change of heart*, in order to man's fitness for the kingdom of heaven, is no way peculiar to *this* Dispensation rather than to *that* Dispensation.

Let us call it by what name we please, *Regeneration* or *Renovation* or *Conversion* or *Newness of Nature* or *Spiritual Circumcision*, the Change *itself* is alike needful under *every* Dispensation, whether Patriarchal or Levitical or Christian. Its necessity appertains to the very condition of man's apostasy. As an *absolutely inherent* and *specially exclusive* Doctrine, it belongs to no one Dispensation *in particular*. It is rather the property of alienated man *himself* than of the Dispensation under which, in the course of God's Providence, he may have been placed: for we cannot say, that the Implantation of a NEW NATURE, which (as it has been well expressed *) should gradually overpower and weaken and destroy the OLD MAN, was less necessary, to Adam than to Moses, or to Moses than to Peter and Paul and James and John. *One* human being, and one human being *alone*, Perfect Man united to Perfect God, needed not any such Implantation.

Taking this view of the matter, we find Augustine, both expressly bestowing the name of *Sacra-*

* Pusey's Tract on Baptism. p. 116.

ments upon the symbolical Ordinances of the Levitical Church, and likewise professedly shewing their correspondence with the Sacraments of the Christian Church.

The Church, says that illustrious Father, *being a Society within which are comprehended the People of God, even in the pilgrimage of this life, is a thing of very high antiquity. In some men, however, she has only a portion which is natural: while, in others, she has a portion which is spiritual. To such as are natural, appertains the Old Testament: to such as are spiritual, appertains the New. But, in the first times, from Adam unto Moses, both were hidden. From Moses, again, the Old was manifested: and, in that identical Old Testament, the New was hidden, because it was hiddenly signified. But, after that the Lord came in the flesh, the New also was revealed. Then the Sacraments of the Old Testament ceased: but such desires ceased not. For the same desires or concupiscences are in those persons, respecting whom, although born through the Sacrament of the New Testament, the Apostle nevertheless says: that Natural men cannot receive the things which are of the Spirit of God. But, as, in the Sacraments of the Old Testament, certain spiritual persons had life, thus hiddenly appertaining to the New Testament which then was a hidden matter: so likewise now, in the Sacrament of the New Testament which has now been revealed, most persons live only the lives of*

natural men. These, if they be unwilling to profit so as to receive the things of the Spirit of God, to which effect they are exhorted by the apostolical discourse, will appertain to the Old Testament: but, if they shall profit, they will, by the very circumstance of their profiting and accession, appertain to the New Testament, even before they fully apprehend it. — Now the self-same Church, which brought forth Abel and Enoch and Noah and Abraham; that very Church brought forth also Moses and his successors the Prophets, before the coming of the Lord: and the self-same Church, which brought forth them; that very Church also brought forth the Apostles and our Martyrs and all good Christians. For all, though born at different times, similarly appeared: but they are contained in the Society and Fellowship of one single People; and, being citizens of the same city, they have experienced the labours of this pilgrimage. Some of them, indeed, still experience such labours: and others will continue to experience them even unto the end.*

* Ecclesia vero, quod est populus Dei, etiam in istius vitæ peregrinatione, antiqua res est: in aliis hominibus habens animalem portionem, in aliis autem spiritalem. Ad animales pertinet Vetus Testamentum: ad spiritales, Novum. Sed, primis temporibus, utrumque occultum fuit, ab Adam usque ad Moysen. A Moyse autem manifestatum est Vetus: et, in eo ipso, occultabatur Novum, quia occultè significabatur. Postea vero quam in carne Dominus venit, revelatum est Novum: Veteris autem Sacramenta cessarunt, sed concupiscentiæ tales non cessaverunt. In illis enim sunt, quos Apostolus,

Augustine, we see, in the name of the Primitive Church, declares: that, with the very same Moral Regeneration, and for the very same reason, that Moderns under the Gospel must needs be born again in order to a capability of eternal salvation; Ancients, whether under Patriarchism or under the Law, must, similarly and equally and for the like end, be also born again. The times might be different; and the outward forms of the corresponding Sacraments, might be different also: but the inward principle, which rested upon the broad universal circumstance of a *Moral Change of Heart being rendered essentially neces-*

jam per Sacramentum Novi Testamenti natos, adhuc tamen dicit, *Animales non posse percipere quæ sunt Spiritûs Dei.* Sicut autem, in Sacramentis Veteris Testamenti, vivebant quidam spiritales, ad Novum scilicet Testamentum, quod tunc occultabatur, occultè pertinentes: sic et nunc, in Sacramento Novi Testamenti, quod jam revelatum est, plerique vivunt animales. Qui proficere si nolunt *ad percipienda quæ sunt Spiritûs Dei,* quo eos hortatur sermo apostolicus: ad Vetus Testamentum pertinebunt. Si autem proficiunt: et, antequam capiant, ipso profectu et accessu, ad Novum pertinent.—Quæ autem peperit Abel et Enoch et Noe et Abraham; ipsa peperit et Moysen et Prophetas tempore posteriores, ante adventum Domini: et, quæ istos; ipsa, et Apostolos et Martyres nostros et omnes bonos Christianos. Omnes enim, diversis quidem temporibus nati, apparuerunt: sed societate unius populi continentur; et, ejusdem civitatis cives, labores hujus peregrinationis experti sunt, et quidam eorum nunc experiuntur, et usque in finem cæteri experientur. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. i. c. 15, 16. vol. vii. p. 35.

sary by reason of the fall and alienation of man, remained the same under every succeeding Dispensation *. Still from the very time of Adam

* Proinde colligitur: invisibilem Sanctificationem quibusdam affuisse atque profuisse, sine visibilibus Sacramentis; quæ, pro temporum diversitate, mutata sunt, ut alia tunc fuerint, et alia modo sint. August. Quæst. super Levit. lib. iii. quæst. 84. Oper. vol. iv. p. 88.

The statement, that *Sacraments, in their visible appearance, have been changed according to the diversity of times, so that under the Law they bore one form, while under the Gospel they bear another form*, Augustine had introduced with the following question.

Animadvertendum est, quotiens dicit, *Ego Dominus qui sanctifico eum*, loqui, de sacerdote: cum hoc etiam Moysi dixerit, *Et sanctificabis eum*. Quomodo ergo et Moyses sanctificat, et Dominus?

This question he thus answers.

Non enim Moyses pro Domino, sed Moyses visibilibus Sacramentis per ministerium suum: Dominus autem, invisibili gratia per Spiritum Sanctum, ubi est totus fructus etiam visibilium Sacramentorum. Nam, sine ista Sanctificatione invisibilis gratiæ, visibilia Sacramenta quid prosunt?

He then goes on to shew: that this Sanctification of invisible Grace was no less necessary under the Law, than under the Gospel; that corresponding Sacraments, though changed externally as the times of different Dispensations changed, were always the appointed channel of at least visible or outward or official Sanctification, but that invisible Sanctification by the Holy Spirit was in all ages conferred, according to the good pleasure of God, sometimes through the medium of the visible Sacraments, and sometimes in perfect independence of them; and, finally, that, as invisible Sanctification might be received without the instrumentality of visible Sacraments, so visible

down to the present hour and onward even to the end of the world, not that which is spiritual is first, but that which is natural; and, afterward, that which is spiritual *.

In short, as the Apostle teaches us: *He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that Circumcision, which is outward in the Flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and Circumcision is that of the Heart, in the spirit and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God* †.

If any one can distinguish, between St. Paul's *Circumcision of the Heart*, and Augustine's *Conversion of the Heart* which he describes as the Inward Grace of the preceding Sacrament of Regeneration: he possesses greater powers of dis-

Sacraments might be administered without any communication of invisible Sanctification.

The examples, which he successively adduces in corroboration of this view of the question, are: Moses and the Levitical Priesthood, under the Law; John the Baptist, in the intermediate time between the Law and the Gospel; and the Penitent Thief on the cross, Simon Magus, and Cornelius with his Company, under the Gospel.

* Prior autem fuit Ismael, et postea Isaac; et prior Esau, posterior autem Jacob: non quia prior peperit Hæresis quam Ecclesia, aut Ecclesia ipsa prius carnales vel animales, et postea spiritales; sed quia, in ipsa sorte mortalitatis nostræ ex quo de Adam nascimur, non est prius quod spiritale, sed quod animale, postea spiritale. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. i. c. 15. Oper. vol. vii. p. 35.

† Rom. ii. 28, 29.

crimination, than I can venture to claim for myself *.

* Compare Rom. ii. 28, 29, with August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 24, 25. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52, 53.

Augustine's analogical reasoning and conclusion are thus propounded.

Veraciter conjicere possumus, quid valeat in parvulis Baptismi Sacramentum, ex Circumcisionis Carnis, quam prior populus accepit, quam priusquam acciperet, justificatus est Abraham.

Quibus rebus omnibus ostenditur : aliud esse Sacramentum Baptismi, aliud Conversionem Cordis ; sed salutem hominis ex utroque compleri. Nec, si unum horum defuerit, ideo putare debemus consequens esse, ut et alterum desit : quia et illud sine isto potest esse in Infante, et hoc sine illo potuit esse in Latrone.

CHAPTER IV.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY CHURCH TOUCHING THE MORAL EFFECT OF INFANT-BAPTISM.

I SHALL now pass on to the evidence from Antiquity: or rather, what constitutes the difficulty alluded to at the commencement of this discussion of Infant-Baptism, to the *lack* of evidence, as I fear it must be said, so far as the judgment of the *strictly* Primitive Church is concerned.

This lack of evidence we may lament: but, save through the medium of a general allegation of Augustine which will be noticed in its proper place, we cannot remedy it.

The question; *Whether, in the case of Infant-Recipients, Moral Regeneration invariably and always attends upon Outward Baptism:* was never taken up by the first ecclesiastical writers. Nothing is said upon it, by Clement of Rome: nothing, by Ignatius: nothing, by Polycarp: nothing, by Hermas: nothing, by Pseudo-Barnabas: nothing,

by Justin-Martyr: nothing, by his pupil Tatian: nothing, by Athenagoras: nothing, by Theophilus of Antioch: nothing, by the early author of the beautiful Epistle to Diognetus. At that primeval period, while the preaching of the Gospel to the nations was in progress, the number of adult baptisms would very far exceed the number of infant baptisms, perhaps almost in as great a proportion as among ourselves the number of infant baptisms exceeds the number of adult baptisms: and, on that account, not improbably, the question was never raised and agitated. Be this, however, as it may, the *highest* Antiquity of the Church presents nothing save a dead blank.

I. So far as I can find, Irenèus, who in his youth had been a hearer of Polycarp and who flourished during the greater part of the second century, is the earliest writer that throws even a glimmering of light upon the present topic.

The Saviour, says he, *snatched away from destruction the Boys who were in the house of David: for they fitly received the allotment of their birth at that particular time, in order that he, while still an Infant himself, might prepare Infant-Martyrs slain according to Scripture in the city of David on account of Christ who was born in Bethlehem of Judah, and in that capacity might send them before him into his own kingdom* *.

* Pueros eripiebat qui erant in domo David, bene sortiti

1. From a time at least as early as that of Irenèus, these murdered Children, it appears, were counted *Martyrs:* and, as such, in their quality of the precursors of Christ, they were adjudged to have entered into the kingdom of heaven *.

But, *without* Regeneration, an entrance into the kingdom of God is impossible: and yet, most assuredly, these Children had never been *baptised.*

Therefore, in the Primitive Church, it must have been believed: that, at least under *some* circumstances, Children might be regenerated *without* Baptism.

2. The conclusion, thus drawn from the language of Irenèus, *approximates* to the question now before us: but it does not quite exactly *touch* it.

That an Infant, *without* the reception of Bap-

illo tempore nasci, ut eos præmitteret in suum regnum, ipse infans cum esset, infantes hominum martyres parans propter Christum, qui in Bethleem natus est Judæ, in civitate David interfectos secundum Scripturas. Iren. adv. hær. lib. iii. c. 18. p. 204.

* We find, in Cyprian, the same standing idea: that the children, slaughtered by Herod, were to be viewed as Martyrs.

Christi nativitas a martyriis infantium statim cœpit; ut, ob nomen ejus, a bimatu et infra qui fuerant, necarentur. Ætas, necdum habilis ad pugnam, idonea extitit ad coronam. Ut appareret innocentes esse, qui propter Christum necantur, infantia innocens ob nomen ejus occisa est. Cyprian. Epist. lviii. Oper. vol. ii. p. 123.

tism, may die in a state of Regeneracy; and, consequently, that *without* the reception of Baptism, an Infant may be regenerated: does not determine, whether baptised Infants, that live, are, or are not, invariably regenerated *in* Baptism.

The slaughtered Children, we know, were, *without* Baptism, regenerated: at least, so the Early Church must have held; because, otherwise, she could not *scripturally* have expressed her belief, that, as Martyrs, they were admitted into the kingdom of heaven. But we know not, whether the Grace of Regeneration would have been communicated to them *without* Baptism, had a *subsequent* administration of Baptism been in their case possible.

3. We learn, however, at any rate, from the primitive persuasion before us; that *The Baptism of Infants was not deemed* ABSOLUTELY *essential to their Regeneration:* and, therefore, to this extent, we learn; that *Moral Regeneration and Infant-Baptism were not believed to be* ABSOLUTELY *inseparable.*

II. Through the similar medium of fair deduction, some yet further light is thrown upon the subject by Tertullian, who wrote about twenty or thirty years after Irenèus.

According to the condition and the situation and also the age of each person, says he, *the deferring of Baptism is more useful: but this yet especially is the case with regard to Children. For why need*

Sponsors be implicated in unnecessary danger: since they themselves, either, through death, may be precluded from making good their promises at the font; or, by the future developement of an essentially bad disposition in their charge, may find themselves to have been grievously deceived in their estimate. The Lord, indeed, says: Hinder them not from coming unto me. Let them come, then, when they have grown up to the estate of youth: let them come, when they can learn something, and when they can be taught whither they ought to come: let them be made Christians, when they shall be capable of knowing Christ. Why does the innocent age of Infancy hasten to the remission of sins? In worldly matters, men act more cautiously. Strange, then, is it, that divine riches should be intrusted to those, with whom we intrust not earthly riches. Let them know how to beg for salvation, that you may seem to have granted something to their own petition.—They, who understand the weightiness of Baptism, will incline to fear its attainment, much rather than its delay. A sound faith is secure of salvation *.

* Pro cujusque personæ conditione ac dispositione etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior: præcipuè, tamen, circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est, sponsores etiam periculo ingeri, qui et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, et proventu malæ indolis falli? Ait, quidem, Dominus: *Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire.* Veniant ergo, dum adolescunt: veniant, dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur:

Tertullian, as I understand him, wishes to intimate: that Regeneration might be *more* certainly looked for, as communicated to *Those who were baptised in a Mature Age and upon the strength of their own convictions*, than as communicated to mere *Infants who were received federally into the Church under the promise and stipulation of their Sponsors;* because, while *a sound faith is secure of salvation*, an unsound or imperfect faith, such as *might* be the secondary or imputed faith of Infants, may in no wise be similarly beneficial.

Hence, more especially in the case of Infants, he recommends the deferring of Baptism; and the ground, which he takes for such recommendation, is two-fold: either, by their own death, Sponsors might be prevented from doing their promised duty to their godchildren; or, in consequence of an early development of determined wickedness in their charge, they might have but too much reason to deem themselves mistaken in having charitably supposed that the Children had really experienced a morally beneficial Change through Baptism.

fiant Christiani, quum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum? Cautius agetur in secularibus: ut, cui substantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur. Norint petere salutem, ut petenti dedisse videaris.—Si qui pondus intelligant baptismi, magis timebunt, consecutionem, quam dilationem. Fides integra secura est de salute. Tertull. de Baptism. Oper. p. 710, 711.

Language of this description, I suppose, could never have been held, if the Church was well known to have taught, from the very beginning: that *Infant-Baptism and Moral Regeneration are, under all circumstances, absolutely inseparable.*

III. In the Work intitled *Questions and Answers to the Orthodox*, which has sometimes been given to Justin Martyr, though, from its twice mentioning Origen, it cannot be earlier than the middle of the third century *: a principle of a very peculiar nature is introduced.

The principle is this: that The Beneficial Reception of Baptism, on the part of an Infant, depends upon the faith and sincerity of the Sponsors.

Children, says the author of the present Work, *are, by the faith of those who offer them to Baptism, accounted worthy of the benefits through Baptism* †.

1. With the abstract soundness, or unsoundness, of the principle itself, we have no concern. Our sole business is with doctrine plainly involved in it, wherever, in point of fact, such principle *exists*.

Now that doctrine is altogether homogeneous

* Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthod. quæst. lxxxii, lxxxvi. in Oper. Justin. p. 342, 344.

† Ἀξιοῦνται δὲ τῶν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν, τῇ πίστει τῶν προσφερόντων αὐτὰ τῷ βαπτίσματι. Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthod. quæst. lvi. in Oper. Justin. p. 330.

with the doctrine taught in the administration of Adult-Baptism: and it plainly rests upon the very same theological basis.

If an Adult, in his own person, returned the Answer of a good conscience to the Legitimate Interrogation of the Church: then the Inward Grace of Baptism was held to attend upon its Outward Administration. But, if the Adult, devoid of faith and in the evil spirit of either gross profaneness or mere secularity, returned an insincere and simulative Answer: then, though outwardly baptised, he would fail of being inwardly regenerated.

In like manner, if an Infant, in the person of his Sponsors, returned, to the Ecclesiastical Interrogation, the Answer of a good conscience: then the Grace of Regeneration, it was argued, would attend upon his Baptism. But, if, in the person of his Sponsors, he returned an Answer devoid of faith and sincerity: then, though outwardly baptised, he would similarly fail of being inwardly regenerated.

2. Such, I take it, is the doctrine involved in the principle. Let the Principle, then, *abstractedly*, be itself sound or unsound, the simple fact of its *Recorded Existence* is obviously of prime importance in ascertaining the faith of the Primitive Church.

The matter, I apprehend, so far as concerns the testimonial use of the fact of *Existence*, stands thus.

To the doctrine, that *Moral Regeneration* INVARIABLY *attends upon Infant-Baptism*, the very position, which the principle now before us takes up, is directly and fatally opposed.

Infants, like Adults, as being born in sin and thence as the children of wrath, are, *in themselves*, by the force of the principle, exhibited as *inherently* unworthy Recipients. Hence, as our author expresses it, they must, by a previous and preparatory faith, be *made worthy* or be *reputed worthy*.

But, this faith, they themselves are physically incapable of entertaining. Consequently, *in themselves*, they are, by reason of their *inherent* unworthiness, disqualified to receive the benefits conferred through the instrumental mean of Baptism.

How, then, is the deficiency to be supplied, so that they may *become* worthy Recipients?

The answer was: *By the faith of those who offer them to Baptism.*

Such being the case, in the very necessity of the principle now before us, if the Sponsors lacked faith, the Infant, as he was *born*, still *remained*, a child of wrath, and therefore unworthy.

Whence, in the same necessity, he was, on such a supposition, adjudged, to have received indeed Outward Baptism, but not to have received along with it Inward Regeneration. *His*

body, as Cyril speaks analogously of an Adult, *he baptised with Water: but he illuminated not his heart with the Spirit. His body descended and ascended: but his soul was not buried along with Christ, nor was it raised up again with him**.

This, in its necessary operation, was the *principle*.

Now a principle of *this* description could never have been adopted, if, from the beginning, the familiar doctrine of the Church had been: that *Moral Regeneration* INVARIABLY *attends upon Infant-Baptism*. But, in point of fact, the principle *was* adopted. Therefore no such doctrine could have been the familiar and primeval doctrine of the Catholic Church.

3. Whether tenable or untenable, the principle itself was of no solitary adoption. The author of *Questions and answers* propounds it without any hesitation: and Augustine, a century and a half later, familiarly recognises it as of no novel invention, and attempts to vindicate it on the ground of theological correlativeness.

As, on the part of those, says he, *through whom Infants are born again, the Spirit of Righteousness, by their own Answer, transfers and makes over to the Children that faith, which, by their proper will, they could not as yet possess: so, on*

* Cyril. Hieros. Proëm. in Catech. p. ii. See above, book ii. chap. 7. § I. 6.

the part of those through whom Infants are physically born, the carnality of sin transfers and makes over to the Children that original evil, which, in their proper life and in the way of positive actuality, they have not as yet contracted.*

IV. It is somewhat mortifying to be obliged, in evidence, to pass forthwith to Augustine: but, in excuse, I can only plead my want of early materials.

At a later period than the commencement of the fifth century, we may very possibly find abundant assertions that *Infants are* ALWAYS *morally regenerated in Baptism:* for, as, by many persons, the doctrine both *has been* and *is still* held, it *must*, though it cannot be traced up to the apostolic age, have originated at *some* time. But, wherever, unsupported by ancient assertions to the same effect, such more modern assertions may exist, Chronology forbids them to be of any value in determining the question now before us.

Augustine, however, both by his own distinct statements, and by his confirmatory appeal to the then well known sentiments of the Universal Church, strikes me as specially illuminating the

* Sicut ergo eorum, per quos renascuntur (infantes), Justitiæ Spiritus, Responsione sua, trajicit in eos fidem, quam voluntate propria nondum habere potuerunt: sic eorum, per quos nascuntur, caro peccati trajicit in eos noxam, quam nondum vita propria contraxerunt. August. de peccat. merit. et remiss. cont. Pelagian. lib. iii. c. 2. Oper. vol. vii. p. 274.

present subject. The primeval sentiments of the Church Catholic had never, indeed, been formally defined and authoritatively confirmed by the consentient voice of any General Council, inasmuch as hitherto there had been no dispute on the question: but an appeal like that of Augustine virtually makes his testimony, though delivered at the beginning of the fifth century, to be primeval testimony; and his unequivocal statements become the more valuable and important, when they are perused with reference to the chronologically earlier notices, which, with some degree of painfulness, have already, however scantily, been gleaned.

1. I shall commence with giving the statements themselves in his own precise words.

(1.) The first statement occurs in his Treatise on Baptism.

As, in the case of the penitent thief, salvation, was perfected, though, through necessity, the Sanctification of the Baptismal Sacrament was absent; because, through piety, that Sanctification was spiritually present: so likewise, when such Sanctification is corporally present, salvation may be accomplished; even though, through necessity, that be absent which was present to the thief.

Accordingly, this very point is traditionally held by the Universal Church touching Infant-Baptism.

Infants, certainly, as Infants, cannot yet believe with the heart unto righteousness, nor can they

confess with the mouth unto salvation: which the thief could do.

Furthermore, when, in their persons, that Sacrament is celebrated: they, with their cries and their wailing, obstreperously even oppose the mystical words themselves,

Yet no Christian would ever have said: that they were, therefore, fruitlessly baptised.

Now, although it is most rightly believed, that, WHAT THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH HOLDS AND HAS ALWAYS HELD, THOUGH NOT DETERMINED BY ANY COUNCIL, COULD ONLY HAVE BEEN RECEIVED FROM APOSTOLICAL AUTHORITY : *still, if any one, in this matter, seeks the explicitness of Divine Authority; we may, from that Circumcision of the Flesh which the prior people received, inasmuch as Abraham was justified before he received it, truly gather the availment of the Baptismal Sacrament in the case of Infants *.*

As Abraham, then, was justified before he was circumcised; so Cornelius was enriched even with

* It will doubtless be observed, that the whole of this argument proceeds on the principle constantly recognised by the Early Church: the principle, to wit, that *Circumcision under the Law was a Sacrament morally corresponding with the Sacrament of Baptism under the Gospel.* Most strange it is, that, so far as primitive testimony is of any avail, their virtual identity should ever have been controverted. Without the admission of this identity, the argument of Augustine cannot advance a single step.

the gift of the Holy Ghost, before he was baptised. Nevertheless, concerning Abraham himself, the Apostle says: He received the sign of Circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith; *although he had already believed in his heart, and although this belief was imputed unto him for righteousness.*

Now why was it commanded unto him; that, on the eighth day, he should, ever hereafter, circumcise each male infant, who as yet could not believe in his heart in order that it might be imputed unto him for righteousness: save, because the Sacrament, even through itself, was of great avail?

This matter was manifested in the son of Moses: who, when, still uncircumcised, he was carried by his mother, was, by evident danger, imperiously required to be circumcised; insomuch that, after the rite had been duly performed, the impending destruction was averted.

As, then, in Abraham, the Righteousness of Faith preceded, and Circumcision was subsequently added as the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith: so, in Cornelius, Spiritual Sanctification, in his house, by the Holy Ghost, preceded; and the Sacrament of Regeneration was subsequently added, in the Washing of Baptism.

And, as, in Isaac, who was circumcised on the eighth day after his birth, the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith preceded; and, since he imitated the faith of his father, that same Righteousness,

the Seal of which had preceded in his Infancy, followed afterward in his Adult State: so, likewise, in baptised Infants, the Sacrament of Regeneration precedes; and, if they hold fast christian piety, Conversion, the Sacrament of which precedes in the body, follows afterward also in the heart.

And, as, in that thief, what, from the Sacrament of Baptism, was wanting, the benignity of the Omnipotent completed; because the deficiency sprang, not from pride or contempt, but from necessity: so, in Infants, who die after having been baptised, we must believe, that the same grace of the Omnipotent completes, what, not from an evil will but purely from defect of age, was wanting in them; namely, their inability to believe with the heart unto righteousness and to confess with the mouth unto salvation.

Therefore, when others answer for them, in order that, so far as we are concerned, the celebration of the Sacrament may be complete: this sponsion, because they are unable to answer for themselves, avails to their consecration. But, if another person answers for one who can answer for himself, it does not similarly avail. On this principle runs that saying in the Gospel; He is of age, let him speak for himself: *to which, when it is read to them, all naturally assent.*

By these several matters, it is clearly shewn: that THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM IS ONE THING; AND CONVERSION OF THE HEART, ANOTHER THING.

But the salvation of man is completed in them both.

Nevertheless, if one of them be wanting, we must not therefore deem it a necessary consequence, that the other should be wanting also: because the one, BAPTISM *to wit, may, in an Infant, be without the other, that is to say,* CONVERSION; *while, in the thief,* CONVERSION *indisputably existed without* BAPTISM. *For God himself, whether in the one case or in the other, completed what was not deficient from the will: whereas, if, from the will, either were wanting; then the individual would be involved in guilt.*

Accordingly, OUTWARD BAPTISM *may be administered, where* INWARD CONVERSION OF THE HEART *is wanting: and, on the other hand,* INWARD CONVERSION OF THE HEART *may exist, where* OUTWARD BAPTISM *has never been received. Yet, of course,* INWARD CONVERSION OF THE HEART *can never exist in a person, who has profanely despised* OUTWARD BAPTISM: *for, in no wise, must we say; that* INWARD CONVERSION OF THE HEART TO GOD *has been effected, when the* SACRAMENT OF GOD *has been despised* *.

* Sicut autem, in latrone, quia per necessitatem corporaliter defuit (Sanctificatio Sacramenti), perfecta salus est; quia, per pietatem, spiritaliter affuit: sic et, cum ipsa præsto est, si per necessitatem desit quod latroni affuit, perficitur salus.

Quod traditum tenet universitas Ecclesiæ, cum parvuli infantes baptizantur; qui certè nondum possunt credere

(2.) The second statement occurs in his fifth Tractate on the first Epistle of St. John.

corde ad justitiam et ore confiteri ad salutem : quod latro potuit.

Quinetiam, flendo et vagiendo cum in eis mysterium celebratur, ipsis mysticis vocibus obstrepunt.

Et, tamen, nullus Christianorum dixerit, eos inaniter baptizari.

Et, si quisquam in hac re autoritatem divinam quærat, quanquam QUOD UNIVERSA TENET ECCLESIA, NEC CONCILIIS INSTITUTUM, SED SEMPER RETENTUM EST, NON NISI AUTHORITATE APOSTOLICA RECTISSIME CREDITUR : tamen veraciter conjicere possumus, quid valeat in parvulis Baptismi Sacramentum, ex Circumcisione carnis quam prior populus accepit ; quam priusquam acciperet, justificatus est Abraham.

Sicut Cornelius etiam, dono Spiritus Sancti, priusquam baptizaretur, ditatus est. Dicit tamen Apostolus de ipso Abraham ; *Signum accepit Circumcisionis, signaculum justitiæ fidei :* qui jam corde crediderat ; et deputatum illi erat ad justitiam.

Cur ergo ei præceptum est, ut omnem deinceps infantem octavo die circumcideret, qui nondum potuerat corde credere, ut ei deputaretur ad justitiam : nisi quia et ipsum, per seipsum, sacramentum multum valebat ?

Quod in filio Moysi per angelum manifestatum est : qui cum adhuc incircumcisus a matre ferretur, præsenti et evidenti periculo, ut circumcideretur, exactum est : et, eum factum esset, depulsa est pernicies.

Sicut ergo, in Abraham, præcessit fidei justitia, et accessit Circumcisio signaculum justitiæ fidei : ita, in Cornelio, præcessit sanctificatio spiritalis, in domo, Spiritus Sancti ; et accessit Sacramentum Regenerationis, in lavacro Baptismi.

Et, sicut, in Isaac, qui octavo suæ nativitatis die circumcisus est, præcessit signaculum justitiæ fidei ; et, quoniam patris fidem imitatus est, secuta est in crescente ipsa justitia,

Behold, a man, when baptised, has received the Sacrament of his Nativity. He hath a Sacrament,

cujus signaculum in infante præcesserat: ita et, in baptizatis infantibus, præcedit Regenerationis Sacramentum; et, si christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequitur etiam in corde Conversio, cujus Mysterium præcessit in corpore.

Et sicut, in illo latrone, quod ex Baptismi Sacramento defuerat, complevit Omnipotentis benignitas; quia, non superbia vel contemptu, sed necessitate, defuerat: sic, in infantibus qui baptizati moriuntur, eadem gratia Omnipotentis implere credenda est; quod, non ex impia voluntate, sed ex ætatis indigentia, nec corde credere ad justitiam possunt, nec ore confiteri ad salutem.

Ideo, cum alii pro eis respondent, ut impleatur, erga nos, celebratio Sacramenti: valet utique ad eorum consecrationem, quia ipsi respondere non possunt. At, si, pro eo qui respondere potest, alius respondeat: non itidem valet. Ex qua regula, illud in Evangelio dictum est, quod omnes, cum legitur, naturaliter movet: *Ætatem habet: ipse pro se loquatur.*

Quibus rebus omnibus ostenditur: aliud esse SACRAMENTUM BAPTISMI; aliud, CONVERSIONEM CORDIS: sed salutem hominis ex utroque compleri.

Nec, si unum horum defuerit, ideo putare debemus consequens esse, ut et alterum desit: quia et ILLUD, sine ISTO, potest esse in infante; et HOC, sine ILLO, potuit esse in latrone; complente Deo, sive in illo, sive in isto, quod non ex voluntate defuisset: cum vero, ex voluntate, alterum horum defuerit, reatu hominem involvi.

Et BAPTISMUS quidem potest inesse, ubi CONVERSIO CORDIS defuerit: CONVERSIO autem CORDIS potest quidem inesse, non percepto BAPTISMO. Sed, contempto, non potest: neque enim ullo modo dicenda est CONVERSIO CORDIS AD DEUM, cum DEI SACRAMENTUM contemnitur. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 23, 24, 25. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52, 53.

and a great Sacrament; divine, holy, ineffable. Consider what it is: that it should even make a new man by the remission of all sins. Let him, however, attend to his HEART: *whether that be* THERE *perfected, which has been done in his* BODY. *Let him see, whether he has charity: and then let him say, I have been born of God. If he hath it not, he bears indeed a character impressed upon him: but he only wanders about as a deserter. Let him have charity: otherwise, let him not say, that he has been born of God.*

But I have, says he, the SACRAMENT.

Hear, then, the Apostle.

If I know all sacraments, and have all faith so that I could remove mountains; and yet have not charity: I am nothing.

In the whole of St. John's Epistle, nothing is so much commended as charity: insomuch that, if he seems to introduce other subjects, he constantly returns to that topic, and would always refer to charity whatsoever he may happen to introduce.

Let us see, whether he does not do it here. Listen, then.

Every one, who hath been born of God, doth not commit sin.

We ask: What sin? For, if every sin is literally to be understood, the explanation will run contrary to that passage: If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

Let him, then, specify: What sin he means.— Behold the entire drift and purpose of his circumlocution.

Every one, who is born of God, sinneth not: because his seed remaineth in him.

He means the seed of God: that is the word of God. Hence the Apostle says: I have begotten you through the Gospel.

And he cannot sin, because he hath been born of God.

Let us then, see, in what he cannot sin.

In this, are manifested the sons of God, and the sons of the Devil. Every one, who is not righteous, is not of God: and he, who loveth not his brother.

It is now clearly manifested, why he says: And he who loveth not his brother. *Love alone constitutes the distinction, between the sons of God, and the sons of the Devil. Let all, with whatever apparent devotion, sign themselves with the sign of the cross of Christ; let all answer, Amen; let all sing, Hallelujah; let all be baptised; let all enter the churches; let all build the walls of cathedrals: still, the sons of God, and the sons of the Devil, are only distinguished from each other by charity. They, who have charity,* HAVE BEEN BORN OF GOD: *and they, who have it not,* HAVE NOT BEEN BORN OF GOD*.

* August. in 1 Epist. Joan. Tractat. v. Oper. vol. ix. p.

(3.) The third statement will be found in his Treatise on the Deserts and Remission of Sins.

By the grace of God, through the Baptism of him who came in the similitude of sinful flesh, this is certainly effected in little children: that sinful flesh, or original sin, should be made void. But it is made void, not to such an extent, that concupiscence, sown and innate as it is in living flesh, should suddenly be consumed and should altogether cease to exist: but only that that, which was inherent in a person at his birth, should not operate destructively to him after his death. For, if an Infant should live after Baptism, and should arrive at an age capable of instruction, he still has that with which he must fight: and, by God's help, he may overcome it, if he shall not have received his grace in vain, and if he shall be unwilling to be a reprobate.*

(4.) The fourth statement occurs in his Treatise on Baptism.

220. For the original Latin, see above, book ii. chap. 9. § III. 6. note.

* In parvulis certè, gratia Dei, per Baptismum ejus qui venit in similitudine carnis peccati, id agitur, ut evacuatur caro peccati. Evacuatur autem, non ut in ipsa vivente carne concupiscentia conspersa et innata repentè absumatur et non sit: sed, ne obsit mortuo, quæ inerat nato. Nam, si post Baptismum vixerit, atque ad ætatem capacem præcepti pervenire potuerit: ibi habet, cum qua pugnet, eamque adjuvante Deo superet; si non in vacuum gratiam ejus susceperit, si reprobatus esse noluerit. August. de peccat. merit. et remiss. lib. i. c. 39. Oper. vol. vii. p. 262.

Many carnal and natural men are baptised within the pale of the Church: for the Apostle openly declares, that The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; *so that, even when they have received Baptism, he still calls them* natural.

But, except from God, the soul, which is given up to the corporeal senses, cannot but have its savour according to carnal sense.

Hence many persons who make a profiting after Baptism, and most especially those who have been baptised when infants or children, by how much the more their intellect is illuminated while the inner man is renewed from day to day, reject, with detestation and confession, their former opinions, which they held concerning God when they were mocked by their own vain imaginations.

Yet they are not, on that account, deemed to have never received Baptism; nor are they said to have received only a Baptism conformable to their error: but, in them, both the integrity of the Sacrament is honoured, and the vanity of their mind is amended; even though it might have been hardened and rendered callous by many contentions *.

* Multi carnales et naturales etiam intus baptizantur, cum apertè dicit Apostolus; *Animalis autem homo non percipit ea quæ sunt Spiritus Dei:* et, percepto jam Baptismo, dicit eos adhuc animales esse.

Secundum sensum autem carnalem, non potest nisi de Deo carnaliter sapere anima corporeis sensibus dedita.

Unde multi post Baptismum proficientes, et maximè qui

2. I shall now offer a few remarks on the preceding statements; though, indeed, they are so plain and explicit, as to be well nigh incapable of misapprehension.

(1.) It has often been alleged: that *Augustine teaches the Invariable Concomitancy of Regeneration upon Infant-Baptism:* and this, so far as ancient testimony is concerned, has been set down as absolutely conclusive against the Doctrine of their possible Separability; which, thence, is asserted to be a mere hesternal dogma, the fond reverie of well-meaning Moderns, but totally unknown to the Early Church.

Perhaps it would be difficult to find a passage, where such a proposition is, by Augustine, set forth broadly and unrestrictedly. Indeed, if a passage of this description could be pointed out,

infantes vel pueri baptizati sunt, quanto magis intellectus eorum serenatur et illuminatur, dum interior homo renovatur de die in diem, priores suas opiniones, quas de Deo habebant cum in suis phantasmatibus ludificarentur, et detestantes atque confitentes, abjiciunt.

Nec, tamen, ideo non accepisse Baptismum existimantur; aut talem Baptismum accepisse dicuntur, qualis fuit error ipsorum: sed, in eis, et Sacramenti integritas honoratur, et mentis vanitas emendatur; etiamsi, confirmata, et fortasse multis contentionibus defensa, calluerat. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 15. Oper. vol. vii. p. 50.

In this passage, Augustine, I think, evidently alludes to his own personal case, while he was entangled in the impious vanities of Manichèism.

we should still be obliged to interpret it with some degree of limitation: for, otherwise, we should make that Father contradict himself. He teaches, as we have seen, that the Regeneration of Infants in Baptism depends upon the faith and sincerity of their Sponsors *. Hence, if he deemed their Regeneration *contingent* upon the faith and sincerity of others: it is difficult to conceive, how, in severe strictness of language, he could also have deemed it *absolute* and *certain*.

However, with this necessary exception, I am no way inclined to dispute the general correctness of the assertion: that *Augustine taught the Invariable Concomitancy of Regeneration upon Infant-Baptism*. In different parts of his writings, something of the sort seems to be implied, if not directly expressed: and, at all events, in a generalising tone, he indisputably speaks of Infants, with a seeming *collectiveness*, as being regenerated in Baptism †.

But, in truth, to our present purpose, this is a

* See above, book iii. chap. 4. § III. 3.

† Reatus autem ille, qui sola Regeneratione dimittitur, quemadmodum cum inesset non sentiebatur, ita ejus ablatio fide creditur, non carne vel mente sentitur.—Ergo verum est, nos mortuos esse peccato in morte Christi, quæ fuit sine peccato: ac, per hoc, et majores et parvuli. August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. vi. c. 5. Oper. vol. vii. p. 386.

Verum etiam, quia præputium peccatum significat, et invenitur in nascente, quod jam non erat in parente: profecto originale peccatum, quod jam remissum est parentibus baptizatis,

matter of such very little consequence, that it is not worth the litigation.

Let the assertion, then, be admitted to its fullest extent. Let the allowed Doctrine of Augustine be: that *Infants are* INVARIABLY *regenerated in and through Baptism.*

(2.) At the very commencement of this Treatise, I took occasion to notice the great value and necessity of correct definition: inasmuch as, without it, two resolute disputants, not having settled the import of their terms, may bootlessly engage in an interminable controversy. Before we say any thing about either the Separability or the Inseparability of Baptism and Regeneration, we must settle the Ideality of the term *Regeneration* itself*.

manere demonstrat in parvulis, nisi et ipsi baptizentur, id est, Spiritali Circumcisione mundentur. Ibid. c. 7. p. 387.

Sicut eos (scil. parvulos) vitæ spiritus in Christo regenerat fideles: sic eos corpus mortis in Adam generaverat peccatores. Illa enim carnalis generatio est; hæc, spiritualis: illa facit filios carnis; hæc, filios Spiritus: illa, filios mortis; hæc, filios resurrectionis: illa, filios sæculi; hæc, filios Dei: illa, filios iræ; hæc, filios misericordiæ: ac, per hoc, illa, peccato originali obligatos; ista, omnis peccati vinculo liberatos. August. de peccat. merit. et remiss. cont. Pelagian. lib. iii. c. 2. Oper. vol. vii. p. 274.

In parvulis natis et nondum baptizatis, agnoscatur Adam: in parvulis natis et baptizatis et ob hoc renatis, agnoscatur Christus. August. de Verb. Apost. serm. viii. c. 8. Oper. vol. x. p. 99.

* See above, book i. chap. 1.

When Augustine speaks of the Regeneration of Infants through Baptism, what is the idea which he annexes to the word? Does he mean, by it, *A Moral Change of Disposition*, or only *A Federal Change of Condition*?

The first of the preceding extracts fully answers this important question.

Augustine does not there intimate, that that *Moral Change of Disposition*, which is the Inward Spiritual Grace of Baptism, and which throughout this Treatise I have designated by the name of *Moral Regeneration*, is the Regeneration of which Infants by their Baptism participate: but, on the contrary, as being unable to believe with the heart and to confess with the mouth, he absolutely pronounces them *incapable* of any such Moral Regeneration.

The only Regeneration, of which he believes them to partake, is that *Federal Regeneration*, which is defined to be a *Federal Change of Relative Condition*. They are brought into covenant with God by Baptism: they are translated from the Wilderness of Gentilism: they are admitted into the pale of the Visible Church: their right to all christian privileges is officially signed and sealed to them: and they are purified from the taint, and liberated from the penalty, of original sin *.

* Nihil agitur aliud, cum parvuli baptizantur, nisi ut incorporentur Ecclesiæ, id est, Christi corpori membrisque socientur.

But, with respect to their *Moral Regeneration*,

August. de peccat. merit. et remiss. cont. Pelagian. lib. iii. c. 4. Oper. vol. vii. p. 274.

Quare moriuntur parvuli infantes? Nam, si dicam, *Quare moriuntur grandes homines?* dicturus es mihi, *Peccaverunt.* Ergo de majorum ætate non disputabo: parvulorum infantiam contra te testem citabo. Non loquunter; et convincunt: tacent; et, quod dico, probant. Ecce infantes, in suis utique operibus, innocentes sunt; nihil secum, nisi quod de primo homine traxerunt, habentes: quibus propterea est Christi gratia necessaria, ut in Christo vivificentur, qui in Adam mortui sunt; ut, quia inquinati sunt generatione, purgentur Regeneratione. August. de Verb. Apost. serm. vii. c. 6. Oper. vol. x. p. 97.

Lavacro sanctæ Regenerationis abluti, universorum remissionem acceperunt peccatorum. August. de Civit. Dei. lib. i. c. 27. Oper. vol. v. p. 14.

Sicut, in Isaac,—secuta est in crescente ipsa justitia, cujus signaculum in infante præcesserat: ita et, in baptizatis infantibus, præcedit Regenerationis Sacramentum; et, si christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequitur etiam in corde Conversio. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 24. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52.

Nec conjuges infideles, quamlibet sanctis et justis conjugibus hæreant, ab iniquitate mundantur, quæ a regno Dei separatos in damnationem venire compellit: nec parvuli, de quibuslibet sanctis justisque procreati, originalis peccati reatu absolvuntur, nisi in Christo fuerint baptizati. August. de peccat. merit. et remiss. cont. Pelagian. lib. iii. c. 13. Oper. vol. vii. p. 277.

Parvuli infantes baptizantur, qui certè nondum possunt corde credere ad justitiam et ore confiteri ad salutem, quod latro potuit: quinetiam, flendo et vagiendo cum in eis mysterium celebratur, ipsis mysticis vocibus obstrepunt. Et tamen nullus Christianorum dixerit eos inaniter baptizari. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 23. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52.

or that Regeneration which is defined to be a *Moral Change of Disposition*, he distinctly tells us: that, since the Baptism of an Infant may (or rather, indeed, according to his Theology, *must*) be without it, we ought to hope and trust, that, what has been spiritually wanting in his Outward Baptism, may hereafter be completed in the real *Moral Conversion of his Heart*.

In baptised Infants, says he, *the Sacrament of* REGENERATION *precedes: and, if they hold fast christian piety*, CONVERSION, *the Sacrament of which had preceded in the Body, follows afterward in the Heart also* *.

With Augustine, *Moral Regeneration* and *Conversion of the Heart* are identical: for, of both

* In baptizatis infantibus, præcedit *Regenerationis* Sacramentum: et, si christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequitur etiam in corde *Conversio*, CUJUS Mysterium præcessit in corpore. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 24. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52.

Perhaps I need scarcely observe, that, in the technical phraseology of the Latin Church, the words, *Mystery* and *Sacrament*, were used as mutually convertible terms. The passage, here cited from Augustine, affords a somewhat curious example of this practice. In a single sentence, Baptism is indifferently styled a *Sacrament* and a *Mystery*. It is the *Sacrament of Regeneration:* and it is the *Mystery of Conversion:* that *Mystery*, which, in the Body, is said to precede the Inward Grace of *Conversion* or *Regeneration* in the Heart, when the Inward Grace, as in the case of Infants who can neither believe with the heart unto righteousness nor confess with the mouth unto salvation (for so runs the doctrinal theology

alike, he makes Baptism, we see, to be the Sacrament or Mystery or Outward Visible Sign in the Body.

Now he tells us, that, in an Infant, Baptism both may and does subsist *without* Conversion: and he remarks, that this Conversion, *not* having been bestowed in Baptism because an Infant can neither believe with the heart nor confess with the mouth, must be looked out for at some future period of the Child's life; though, should it please God to cut off a baptised Child in Infancy, he will (*in articulo mortis*, I suppose) mercifully complete and make good what had previously been defective*.

of Augustine), has *not* accompanied the administration of the Outward Sign.

On this same principle of phraseological convertibility, our own Church, which delights in archaisms, gives, in her Office for the administration of the Eucharist, to that Sacrament, the plural name of *Holy Mysteries:* plural, I suppose, because the Supper of the Lord comprehends the *two* Outward and Visible Signs of *both* Bread and Wine.

* With Augustine's just and scriptural view, that *Conversion and Salvation may be had without Baptism, though not when Baptism is contemptuously rejected*, his terrific speculation, which consigns all unbaptised children to perdition, seems to be scarcely reconcileable: unless, indeed, we deem it the legitimate offspring of his novel and unscriptural theory of Election and Reprobation, which might rapidly pronounce all unbaptised children, *as* such, to be clearly marked out as predestinated to damnation.

Quia parvulus non baptizatus non intrat in regnum cœlorum,

No person, I apprehend, can be more plain

et tu dicis et ego. Illi igitur communi adversario, qui dicit non baptizatum parvulum intraturum in regnum cœlorum, resistamus ambo: et, adversus ejus insidiosissima jacula, scutum fidei proferamus. August. de Verb. Apost. serm. xiv. c. 7. Oper. vol. x. p. 110.

Parvulos non baptizatos reos inneetit: et, tanquam iræ filios, etiam si parvuli moriantur, ad condemnationem trahit. August. de peccat. merit. et remiss. cont. Pelagian. lib. ii. c. 4. Oper. vol. vii. p. 263.

Nonne veritas sine ulla dubitatione testatur, non solum in regnum Dei non baptizatos parvulos intrare non posse, sed nec vitam æternam posse habere, præter Christi corpus: cui ut incorporentur, Sacramento Baptismatis imbuuntur? Ibid. lib. iii. c. 4. p. 274.

It is true, indeed, that he would make their damnation as light as damnation could be made (whence sprang, I suppose, the notion of a *Limbus Infantum*); but still, in his judgment, condemned they are.

Ego autem non dico, parvulos, sine Christi Baptismate morientes, tanta pœna esse plectendos, ut eis non nasci potius expediret.—Si enim, quod de Sodomis ait, et utique non de solis intelligi voluit, alius alio tolerabilius in die judicii punietur: quis dubitaverit, parvulos non baptizatos, qui solum habent originale peccatum nec ullis propriis aggravantur, in damnatione omnium levissima futuros? Quæ qualis et quanta erit, quamvis definire non possim, non tamen audeo dicere, quod eis, ut nulli essent, quam ut ibi essent, potius expediret. August. cont. Julian. Pelagian. lib. v. c. 11. Oper. vol. vii. p. 379.

They, who, in the case of Infants, hold the absolute *Inseparability of Moral Regeneration and Outward Baptism*; so that, where the *one* is, the *other* is; and, where the *one* is not, the *other* is not: certainly stand pledged, as the inevitable

than Augustine, when Augustine is allowed to speak for himself: and they, who allege this

result of their doctrinal principle, to deny the possibility of Moral Regeneration and thence of Ultimate Salvation, to *Infants who die unbaptised*. But, how Augustine, who, along with the Early Catholic Church (as he testifies), rejected explicitly the Scheme of *Inseparability*, could have adopted and defended so dreadful a speculation, is not a little extraordinary. It is, indeed, the more extraordinary, because the adoption of such a speculation absolutely makes him contradict himself: inasmuch as he elsewhere states, that *Conversion of Heart* or *Moral Regeneration* may subsist, where Baptism is not received, though not where Baptism is despised. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 25. Oper. vol. vii. p. 53. Now an infant cannot despise Baptism. Therefore, if, as Augustine allows, a baptised Infant, who dies in his infancy, will assuredly be saved; there seems to be no reason, why an unbaptised Infant, who similarly dies in his infancy, should not also be saved: inasmuch as neither can be saved without receiving the grace of Moral Regeneration, and inasmuch as no obstacle is placed to the reception of this grace by a contempt of Baptism on the part of an Infant who dies unbaptised.

I marvel, that, in accordance with 1 Corinth. vii. 14, Augustine did not make an exception in favour at least of children of believing parents or even of a single believing parent. Clement of Alexandria well judged from this passage, that the children of sanctified believers were themselves born in a state of covenanted holiness.

Τῶν δὲ ἁγιασθέντων, ἅγιον οἶμαι καὶ τὸ σπέρμα. Ἡγιάσθαι μὲν οὖν ἡμῖν ὀφείλει, οὐ μόνον τὸ πνεῦμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ τρόπος καὶ ὁ βίος καὶ τὸ σῶμα. Ἐπεὶ, τίνι λόγῳ ὁ ἀπόστολος Παῦλος ἡγιάσθαι λέγει τὴν γυναῖκα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, ἢ τὸν ἄνδρα ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικὸς; Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. iii. Oper. p. 445.

illustrious Latin Father as teaching that *All Infants are regenerated in Baptism*, certainly, if they mean to exhibit him as speaking of *Moral Regeneration* contradistinctively to *Federal Regeneration*, represent him as saying precisely the reverse of what he really says.

(3.) In exact harmony with the Doctrine propounded in the first of the cited passages, Augustine, in the second cited passage, alleging the authority of St. John, refers those, who have received the Sacrament of Baptism, to the moral test of Regeneracy laid down by that Apostle.

If their life and conversation, summed up in the single word *Charity*, correspond with the test offered to them: then they may safely conclude, that they have received that *Moral Regeneration* or that *Conversion of Heart*, the Mystery or Sacrament or Outward Sign of which preceded in their Body when they received the symbolical Washing of Baptism.

But, if their life and conversation correspond not with the proposed test: then, however regularly they may have been baptised and however confidently they may plead their participation of the Sacrament, they as yet have never experienced that *Moral Regeneration* or that *Conversion of Heart* which is essentially necessary to their salvation.

I have, says one who has been baptised, *the Sacrament.—Yea, let all be baptised:—still the*

sons of God, and the sons of the Devil, are only distinguished from each other by charity. They, who have charity, have been born of God: and they, who have it not, have not been born of God *.

I really know not, how a theologian could express himself, more precisely, and less ambiguously.

(4.) There is a sense, no doubt, in which Augustine makes Renovation commence with the Baptism of Infants: nor, I suppose, will any person dispute the correctness of his statement.

Since all sin is pardoned in Baptism; agreeably to that exhortation of St. Peter, *Repent, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins* †: under *this* aspect, of course, Renovation may be said always to commence from Baptism; because, in regard to the imputation of sin, the individual is placed in a totally different relative condition from that in which he previously stood. But, the Ideality being still that of a *Federal Change of State*, Augustine duly tells us: that, as yet, the Renovation is only in *hope;* for its *reality*, we must look out to the future.

Every old infirmity of a man is not removed, from the precise hour when he is baptised: but

* Sed habeo, inquit, sacramentum.—Baptizentur omnes:—non discernuntur filii Dei a filiis Diaboli, nisi charitate. Qui habent charitatem, nati sunt ex Deo: qui non habent, non sunt nati ex Deo. August. in 1 Epist. Joan. Tractat. v. Oper. vol. ix. p. 220.

† Acts ii. 38.

Renovation commences, from the remission of all his sins. And, exactly to the amount of a person's savouring spiritual things who already doth savour them: to that same amount is he renewed. The rest, however, are done in HOPE, *until also they be done in* REALITY, *even until the Renovation of the body itself to the better state of immortality and incorruptibility, whither we are conducted in the resurrection of the dead.—For, truly, he, who is still renewed from day to day, is not totally renewed: and, so far as he hath not yet been at all renewed, to that same extent he is still in the moral condition of the Old Man. Hence, because some are still in the condition of the Old Man, although they have been already baptised: they are, on this account, even still the Children of the World. And, conversely, because they are in Newness, that is to say, from the full and perfect remission of their sins; and so far as they savour spiritual things, and order their conversation agreeably thereto: to the same amount, they are the Sons of God*.*

* Non, ex qua hora quisque baptizatur, omnis vetus infirmitas ejus absumitur: sed Renovatio incipit a remissione omnium peccatorum. Et, in quantum quisque spiritalia sapit, qui jam sapit: in tantum renovatur. Cætera vero in SPE facta sunt, donec etiam in RE fiant, usque ad ipsius corporis renovationem in meliorem statum immortalitatis et incorruptionis, qua inducimur in resurrectione mortuorum.—Profecto enim, qui de die in diem adhuc renovatur, nondum totus est renovatus: et, in quantum nondum est renovatus, in tantum adhuc in vetustate est. Proinde, ex hoc quod adhuc in vetustate sunt, quamvis

By the term *Renovation*, explained as a *Renewal from day to day*, Augustine here obviously means *Progressive Sanctification:* which federally may be said to commence, when a person is baptised for the remission of sins; though, literally and morally, it can only commence from the Conversion of the Heart. According to the invariable system and principle of Augustine's theologising, the two ideas of *Federal* and *Moral* run through the whole of this passage.

(5.) Clear as Augustine's several statements may be, the most important part of the matter, in an evidential point of view, is his direct appeal to the testimony of the Catholic Church from the very beginning.

He contends, indeed, that his exposition of the results of Infant-Baptism may, even on the principle of Private Judgment, be abundantly established by a just interpretation of Scripture. But, still, he professedly brings to bear upon his interpretation the recognised Canon: that *Such interpretations of Doctrinal Scripture, as have always, from the beginning, been received and given by the Catholic Church, even though they may not*

jam baptizati ex hoc, etiam adhuc, sunt filii seculi. Ex hoc, autem, quod in novitate sunt, hoc est, ex plena et perfecta remissione peccatorum, et quantumcunque illud est quod spiritaliter sapiunt, eique congruos mores agunt: filii Dei sunt. August. de peccat. merit. et remiss. cont. Pelagian. lib. ii. c. 7. Oper. vol. vii. p. 264.

have been formally laid down by Councils, stand self-approved, as originally delivered by Apostolical Authority.*

Thus, by this remarkable attestation, he becomes, as it were, a host of witnesses in himself. Through it, he supplies the want of direct evidence in the earliest ecclesiastical writers, whose subjects did not lead them specially to touch upon the Doctrine of Infant-Baptism: and, thence, so far as I can judge, he establishes, under the precise aspect of a primitive and universal interpretation, the proposition; that *Moral Regeneration and Infant-Baptism do not stand inseparably connected and associated.*

* Quod Universa tenet Ecclesia, nec Conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi authoritate apostolica traditum, rectissimè creditur. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 24. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52.

Of course, as I explain it in the text, this rule can only be admitted to apply to the ascertaining of the true sense of Doctrinal Scripture. If Antiquity be alleged, as the Romanists allege it, for the purpose of establishing matters extrascriptural or unscriptural: the Church of England rightly charges us to reject it. See Art. vi. The truth, however, is, that Antiquity, as it respects the *Quod* SEMPER of Vincent of Lirins, sanctions nothing, either extrascriptural or unscriptural. Matters, so circumstanced, rest only upon an Antiquity relative and partial, as contradistinguished from an Antiquity positive and aboriginal. A superfluity of miserable absurdities, for instance, may, if we so please, be duly established from the writers of the fourth and fifth centuries: but, as Scripture knows nothing of them, so they cannot be established as having existed *from the beginning*.

BOOK IV.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

CHAPTER I.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TOUCHING REGENERATION.

There has been much speculation in regard to the true import of the Baptismal Offices and other Public Documents of the Church of England: and, on the ground that they indisputably teach the *Inseparability of Outward Baptism and Inward Moral Regeneration,* many very harsh and uncharitable things have been said of the Church herself by those who are not members of her Communion.

Hence, a discussion of this particular will be no improper conclusion to the present Treatise.

I. For the due settlement of her Doctrinal System, the Church of England has always professed, not to adopt the vague and unauthorised

reveries of uninformed Private Judgment, but to resort to the testimony of Antiquity, in regard to what theological tenets were, from the very beginning, received and maintained by the Primitive Church Catholic, as exhibiting the true sense of Holy Scripture: inasmuch as she rightly judged, upon the intelligible principle of *Historical Evidence to a* FACT, that, if she could ascertain the Scheme of Christianity which the Early Church adopted and inculcated out of the Bible, she might be morally certain that she had ascertained the Scheme, originally delivered by the Apostles, and afterward either by themselves or by persons who acted under their immediate direction committed to the eternal durability of imperishable writing *.

II. Taking this view of the question, we cannot

* Mr. Gladstone, as I have cited him above (See Preface, § II. note), has so correctly marked out the Anglican Principle of an *Appeal to Consentient Antiquity from the Beginning for the right Interpretation of Doctrinal Scripture*, that I suppose we must take his statement thus adduced, as an explanation of what he had *previously* said with perhaps not equal distinctness and precision.

In England, to which we must now direct our regard, says he in a slightly earlier portion of his very able Work, *the case was widely different from that of the Continent. Her Reformation did not destroy, but successfully maintained, the Unity and Succession of the Church in her Apostolical Ministry. We have, therefore, still among us, the ordained, hereditary, witnesses of the truth, conveying it to us, through an unbroken*

reasonably doubt, that the Doctrine of the Anglican Church, respecting Outward Baptism and

series, from our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles. This is to us the ordinary Voice of Authority: of Authority, equally reasonable and equally true, whether we will hear or whether we will forbear: of Authority, which does not supersede either the exercise of Private Judgment or the sense of the Church at large or the supremacy of Scripture; but assists the first, locally applies the second, and publicly witnesses to the last. The State in its Relations with the Church. chap. v. § 38. p. 155, 156.

It will be observed, that, in this passage, Mr. Gladstone describes the present Anglican Clergy, as *the* HEREDITARY *witnesses of the truth, conveying it to us,* THROUGH AN UNBROKEN SERIES, *from our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles.*

Now this, although apparently designed to be modified in the latter part of the paragraph, is scarcely a correct account of the official position of us the Anglican Clergy: nor can it be received without considerable limitation and abatement.

The language employed by Mr. Gladstone, according to its simple grammatical construction, would import: that a *Collective Entireness of unmixed Truth* had descended to us, in an unbroken series, through *our clerical predecessors in communion with the Church of Rome,* from the apostolic age itself; and that *we* the English Clergy, receiving in regular succession the *whole* which those predecessors had received from *their* predecessors as the Truth of the Gospel, step by step and by virtue of our canonical ordination, are now, as *the heirs of such predecessors,* its *hereditary* witnesses.

Language, the natural import of which must thus be given, does not communicate an accurate idea of our true position.

So far as our predecessors, the *Clergy in communion with the Roman Church,* faithfully maintained that *Genuine Body*

Moral Regeneration, was carefully derived from the pure fountain of Primeval Antiquity. Accordingly, so perfect is the resemblance of the Anglican Doctrine to the Primitive Doctrine in every particular, that no one, who knows how to value the attesting judgment of the Early Apostolic

of Scriptural Truth, which descended from the very beginning, and which is unanimously attested in still extant documents by Primitive Antiquity: just *so* far, in relation to *them*, we may be deemed *hereditary* witnesses; and, just *so* far, we may be said to have conveyed it, through an *unbroken* series, from the apostolic age.

But, to that huge Doctrinal Mass, which *collectively* the Roman Church defines to be Truth, we assuredly are NOT *hereditary* witnesses nor indeed witnesses under *any* aspect: neither do we, *through an unbroken series*, convey it and teach it as the Truth of Scripture.

Were we in this *last* position, we should *still* be Romanists. *Ceasing* to be Romanists, we have *quitted* this last position.

In a word, while we claim to be *partial* heirs of the Clergy through the unbroken series of the middle ages, we have no ambition to be counted their *universal* heirs. We are hereditary witnesses to the Truth, *as unanimously attested from the beginning:* but we are NOT hereditary witnesses to all, which *the Church of Rome* pronounces to be Truth and receives as Truth and imposes as Truth. Our aim is to be Primitive, not Tridentine, Doctrinists.

To prevent the possibility of misapprehension, groundless misapprehension I make no doubt, I would respectfully suggest to Mr. Gladstone, that, in a future edition of his Work, a recasting of the paragraph which I have cited would be eminently desirable.

Church, would wish, that, even in a single iota, the Baptismal Offices and other allied Documents of the Church of England should ever be made to feel the officious hand, *officious and not valiant*, of ignorant and therefore unskilful alteration.

CHAPTER II.

THE STATEMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

Since Outward Baptism was fully allowed to be a divinely appointed mean of Moral Regeneration; and since all, who make the *Due Answer* to the *Legitimate Interrogation*, whether by themselves or by their Sponsors, were, upon their solemn word, charitably believed to have made, what the Apostle calls, the *Answer of a good Conscience toward God:* the Church of England, carefully treading in the footsteps of the Lord's ancient flock, and feeling that she had no right *generically* to doubt the Regeneration of persons thus circumstanced, was, of course, in her *official* character, led to declare them regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church.

I. To this purpose, accordingly, she speaks in each of her Baptismal Offices: the more ancient Office, to wit, for the Baptism of Infants; and the subsequently added Office for the Baptism of Adults.

First, comes the solemn *Legitimate Interrogation;* without a satisfactory Reply to which, the Church will neither baptise, nor undertake to pronounce a person regenerate: then, the charitably believed *Answer of a good conscience toward God:* then, the *Administration of the Sacrament of Baptism;* which, of old, was emphatically called the *Sacrament of Faith*, from the profession of the sound Catholic Faith in the Creed, which was required to be made by, or on behalf of, every candidate for the holy Mystery: and then, finally, and not till then, the *Official Generic Declaration*, that the baptised person has, through the mean of Baptism, been regenerated.

Here, it will be observed, the Church pronounces none to be regenerate, save those who have *previously* made a Satisfactory Answer and a Sound Confession of Faith: thus resting her determination altogether upon the honesty and sincerity and worthiness of the Recipient *.

Now, under such circumstances, it may well be asked: How could the Church, through her officiating ministers, act otherwise than she has done?

The Church cannot read the heart: and, doubtless, an unworthy subject may offer himself

* This is evident from the circumstance, that, *without* such Answer and *without* such Confession of Faith having been made, the Church would *altogether refuse* the administration of Baptism.

for Baptism. But what then? When, with all due care, the Solemn *Interrogation* has been put; and when the required *Answer* has been given, and the *Confession of Faith* publicly recited: is the Church, through her minister, to turn round upon the candidate and to say; *Though you have answered properly, and though you have confessed soundly, I do not believe a syllable of what you have uttered; and, therefore, albeit I have baptised you, not deeming you to be regenerate, I will not pronounce you regenerate?*

Who does not at once perceive the insulting impropriety of such conduct, if it were possible that such a line of proceeding could be adopted?

But it may be asked: Why need the Church, whether ancient or modern, give *any* opinion, as to the moral state of the person whom she has baptised?

The reason is obvious. How could she, with propriety, admit them into her communion, and thus declare them to be grafted into Christ's mystical body, without also *generically* declaring them to have been regenerated? Had she been *silent*, touching the point of Regeneration, the result would still have been the same.

Take the case of the Church of England, with which at present we are more immediately concerned.

After Baptism, the Priest is directed to say:

We receive this child (or *this person*) *into the congregation of Christ's flock; and do sign him with the sign of the cross, in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed, to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end.*

Now, in saying this, he virtually declares him to be regenerate: for Regeneration is implied in the solemn reception of a person into the congregation of Christ's flock thus expressed.

Should it further be urged; that Baptism ought to be *simply* administered, without addition of any sort: our answer is prompt and easy.

What? Under pretence of doing honour to God and of salving tender consciences, would you have us baptise a person, without a single *inquiry*, either of himself or of others on his behalf, whether he was willing to take upon himself the scriptural obligations of a Christian, and whether he even believed the Articles of the Christian Faith? If this be your plan, it leads to a direct profanation of the Sacrament: for, if we are to make no antecedent *inquiries*, we may, unwittingly, baptise an unbelieving Jew or Pagan or Mohammedan; we may, unwittingly, baptise an individual, who either presents himself, or is brought by others, in pure ribald mockery.

And so, again, with respect to postbaptismal

declarations: are we to deem the person a worthy or an unworthy Recipient? If unworthy: then we ought to have altogether *refused* the administration of Baptism, as feeling that it would be a mere unhallowed ceremony. If worthy: then there can be no reason, why we should object to the *declaring* him regenerate.

I must own I perceive not, how the Baptismal Offices could be changed for the better. Let us only attend to the *ground*, on which the *declaration* is made; namely, *A full Satisfactoriness of Answer and Confession:* and the whole matter will be abundantly plain and intelligible.

The declaration is *conditional:* and it rests entirely upon the presumption of *Sincerity and Worthiness*, as gathered from the Confession and the Answer. If there has been *no* Answer of a good conscience toward God, and if the Confession has been made in *falsehood* and *unbelief*, the declaration is null and void: but the Church, surely, is no way to blame, as she claims not to be an infallible reader of the heart and conscience.

This is quite clear in the case of Adults: and, as to the case of Infants, whether they *do* or *do not* sustain spiritual damage from the unworthiness or insincerity of Sponsors, the Church, even on the supposition that they *do*, precludes them not from God's grace at some future time, though Baptism itself, from which they have indisputably

received a Federal Change of Relative Condition, must in no wise be repeated *.

II. To the same purpose, and agreeably to the same *rationalè*, the Church of England speaks also in the Catechism, which she has provided for the due institution of her younger members.

Each Sacrament, and consequently the Sacrament of Baptism in particular, is defined to be: *An Outward and Visible Sign of an Inward and Spiritual Grace given unto us; ordained by Christ himself, as a mean whereby we receive the same, and as a pledge to assure us thereof.* And, shortly afterward, the Inward and Spiritual Grace of Baptism is pronounced to be: *A Death unto Sin, and a New Birth unto Righteousness; for, being by nature born in sin and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace.*

Such are the definitions: and, agreeably to them, each child is taught to speak of his Bap-

* Some well meaning persons, even *within* the Church (for I speak not now of her captious and malignant *enemies*), have, I believe, occasionally objected to the phraseology of our Baptismal Offices. When explained on the principles of Antiquity, to which they indisputably look, I perceive not how any umbrage can be *legitimately* taken. My own conscience might, probably enough, be shocked, were I constrained to depart from the Primitive Church and to adopt some injudicious *alteration* projected by modern ignorance: but, assuredly, it feels not a single qualm, whenever, in administering the Sacrament of Baptism, I use the Anglican Offices as they *now* stand.

reveries of uninformed Private Judgment, but to resort to the testimony of Antiquity, in regard to what theological tenets were, from the very beginning, received and maintained by the Primitive Church Catholic, as exhibiting the true sense of Holy Scripture: inasmuch as she rightly judged, upon the intelligible principle of *Historical Evidence to a* FACT, that, if she could ascertain the Scheme of Christianity which the Early Church adopted and inculcated out of the Bible, she might be morally certain that she had ascertained the Scheme, originally delivered by the Apostles, and afterward either by themselves or by persons who acted under their immediate direction committed to the eternal durability of imperishable writing *.

II. Taking this view of the question, we cannot

* Mr. Gladstone, as I have cited him above (See Preface, § II. note), has so correctly marked out the Anglican Principle of an *Appeal to Consentient Antiquity from the Beginning for the right Interpretation of Doctrinal Scripture*, that I suppose we must take his statement thus adduced, as an explanation of what he had *previously* said with perhaps not equal distinctness and precision.

In England, to which we must now direct our regard, says he in a slightly earlier portion of his very able Work, *the case was widely different from that of the Continent. Her Reformation did not destroy, but successfully maintained, the Unity and Succession of the Church in her Apostolical Ministry. We have, therefore, still among us, the ordained, hereditary, witnesses of the truth, conveying it to us, through an unbroken*

reasonably doubt, that the Doctrine of the Anglican Church, respecting Outward Baptism and

series, from our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles. This is to us the ordinary Voice of Authority: of Authority, equally reasonable and equally true, whether we will hear or whether we will forbear: of Authority, which does not supersede either the exercise of Private Judgment or the sense of the Church at large or the supremacy of Scripture; but assists the first, locally applies the second, and publicly witnesses to the last. The State in its Relations with the Church. chap. v. § 38. p. 155, 156.

It will be observed, that, in this passage, Mr. Gladstone describes the present Anglican Clergy, as *the* HEREDITARY *witnesses of the truth, conveying it to us,* THROUGH AN UNBROKEN SERIES, *from our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles.*

Now this, although apparently designed to be modified in the latter part of the paragraph, is scarcely a correct account of the official position of us the Anglican Clergy: nor can it be received without considerable limitation and abatement.

The language employed by Mr. Gladstone, according to its simple grammatical construction, would import: that a *Collective Entireness of unmixed Truth* had descended to us, in an unbroken series, through *our clerical predecessors in communion with the Church of Rome,* from the apostolic age itself; and that *we* the English Clergy, receiving in regular succession the *whole* which those predecessors had received from *their* predecessors as the Truth of the Gospel, step by step and by virtue of our canonical ordination, are now, as *the heirs of such predecessors,* its *hereditary* witnesses.

Language, the natural import of which must thus be given, does not communicate an accurate idea of our true position.

So far as our predecessors, the *Clergy in communion with the Roman Church,* faithfully maintained that *Genuine Body*

and cleansed from sin; that we be members and parts of his Church, received into the communion of saints: for Water signifieth the Spirit *.

2. Thus, again, we may adduce the Apology of Bishop Jewell: which is said to have been published with the consent of the Bishops, and which was always understood to speak the sense of the whole Church in whose name it is written.

We receive the Sacraments of the Church: that is, certain sacred signs or ceremonies, which Christ willed us to use, that, by them, he might set before our eyes the mysteries of our salvation, and might the more vehemently confirm our faith which we have in his blood, and might seal his grace in our hearts. These, along with Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Basil, Dionysius, and other Catholic Fathers, we call, figures, signs, symbols, types, antitypes, forms, seals, signets, similitudes, exemplars, images, remembrances, memorials. Nor do we doubt also, with the same Fathers, to say: that they are certain visible words, seals of righteousness, symbols of grace.—Baptism, in particular, we deem to be the Sacrament of the forgiveness of sins and of that ablution which we have in the Blood of Christ. From this, no one, who wishes to profess the name of Christ, ought to be repelled: not even the infants

* King Edward's Catech. in Enchir. Theol. vol. i. p. 52.

of christian men, since they are born in sin and appertain to the people of God.*

3. Thus, finally, we may bring forward the Catechism of Dean Nowel: which the Church of England made her own by giving it the express sanction of Convocation.

As, through Baptism, we are once regenerated in Christ, and are first (as it were) elected and inserted into his body: so, when we rightly receive the Supper of the Lord, we are perpetually nourished and sustained to eternal life, by the divine and salutiferous and life-conferring nutriment of his own body and blood, communicated to us through the operation of the Holy Ghost, and received by us

* Recipimus sacramenta Ecclesiæ, hoc est, sacra quædam signa, cærimonias, quibus Christus nos uti voluit, ut illis mysteria salutis nostræ nobis ante oculos constituerat, et fidem nostram, quam habemus in ejus sanguine, vehementius confirmaret, et gratiam suam in cordibus nostris obsignaret. Eaque, cum Tertulliano, Origene, Ambrosio, Augustino, Hieronymo, Chrysostomo, Basilio, Dionysio, aliisque Catholicis Patribus, figuras, signa, symbola, typos, antitypa, formas, sigilla, signacula, similitudines, exemplaria, imagines, recordationes, memorias, appellamus. Nec dubitamus etiam cum eisdem dicere, esse illa visibilia quædam verba, signacula justitiæ, symbola gratiæ.—Et Baptismum quidem sacramentum esse, remissionis peccatorum, et ejus ablutionis quam habemus in Christi sanguine. Et, ab eo, neminem, qui velit profiteri nomen Christi, ne infantes quidem christianorum hominum, quoniam nascuntur in peccato et pertinent ad populum Dei, arcendos esse. Juell. Apol. Eccles. Anglican. in Enchir. Theol. vol. i. p. 215, 216.

through faith which may be deemed the mouth of our soul.*

* Sicuti, per Baptismum, semel regeneramur in Christo, et in ejus corpus primum quasi cooptamur et inserimur : ita, Cœnam Dominicam rite percipientes, corporis et sanguinis sui nutrimento planè divino et salutis atque immortalitatis plenissimo, Spiritus Sancti opera nobis communicato, a nobis vero fide quasi animæ nostræ ore excepto, ad æternam vitam jugiter alamur atque sustentemur. Noell. Catech. in Enchir. Theol. vol. ii. p. 226.

CHAPTER III.

THE EXPLANATIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THERE will always be more or less danger, that declarations, made *generically*, should be interpreted *specifically*.

The Early Church saw this: and, since her principle, like that of the Church of England, borrowed from the Apostles themselves, and inherent truly in the very nature and condition of such a body as the Church Catholic, was the systematic official adoption of *generic* as contradistinguished from *specific* phraseology; she duly guarded, by careful explanation and strict limitation, against any abuse of her language on the part of *individuals*.

In like manner, the Church of England, yet again treading in the footsteps of the ancient flock, saw the danger of her purely *generic* declarations being interpreted and applied *specifically*: and, thence, in like manner also, for the purpose

of preventing error, resorted to explanation and limitation *.

* The principle of *Genericism* pervades all the Offices of the Church of England: and, in her seventeenth Article, it is, even by name, inculcated.

Promissiones divinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in Sacris Litteris GENERALITER propositæ sunt.

The reader will observe, that, in the Latin Article, the word employed is GENERALITER, not PLERUMQUE.

Many, I believe, who have not consulted the unambiguous Latin Article, understand the ambiguous word GENERALLY of the English Article, in the sense of PLERUMQUE or FOR THE MOST PART. But this is not its import. It denotes GENERICALLY, as opposed to SPECIFICALLY. See my Primitive Doctrine of Elect. book ii. chap. 9. § I. 1. (2.). The Church, as a Body Corporate, can speak officially in no other manner. She cannot perpetually vary her public language to suit the case of each individual: nor, in truth, would it become her, who is no infallible searcher of the heart, to pronounce, at Baptism, an unwarrantable and presumptuous sentence of reprobation and condemnation against any person.

So inherent is this phraseological necessity, that we find the language of *Genericism* constantly employed by the inspired Apostles themselves. When St. Paul, for instance, writes to the Romans, he *generically* addresses himself to ALL that be in Rome, as *beloved of God, called Saints*. He does not *specifically* except, as unworthy of the name, Appius or Valens or Crispus. Yet, I suppose, in the strict sense of the term, we are not thence to conclude, that *every* Roman Christian by profession was a *Saint beloved of God*, demonstrated to be such both by his principle and by his practice.

Nay, even a greater than Paul, even Paul's Divine Master himself, uses the language of *Genericism*, when he addresses his twelve Apostles collectively or collegiately: though, at

I. On this point, let us hear, how carefully she theologises in her Articles.

Baptism is a sign of Regeneration or New Birth: whereby, as by an instrument, they, that receive it RIGHTLY, *are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed; and grace is increased, by virtue of prayer unto God* *.

In such only as WORTHILY *receive the Sacraments, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they, that receive them* UNWORTHILY, *purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith* †.

These sacramental declarations *mainly* respect Adults: in the matter of the Eucharist, *entirely;* in the matter of Baptism, *principally*, though, on some of the points, not *exclusively*.

They shall be considered successively: as they respect Adults; as they respect Infants; and as they respect Adults and Infants conjointly.

1. In the Article, which treats of Baptism, much is introduced, touching *the confirmation of faith and the increase of grace by virtue of prayer*, that can only respect Adults.

Viewing, then, the Article as it treats of Adult-

the very time, he unerringly knew, that one of them was a devil and would betray him. *Behold, I send you forth, as sheep in the midst of wolves.* Yet Judas, *specifically*, answered not to any such description.

* Art. xxvii. † Art. xxv.

Baptism, we shall perceive, that it directly involves the decision of the Anglican Church touching the question: *Whether the conferring of Moral Regeneration be absolutely* TIED *and* LIMITED *to the administration of Outward Baptism;* or *Whether Outward Baptism may not be administered* WITHOUT *any concomitancy of Moral Regeneration.*

Now, in the judgment of the Church of England, we see, as she treats of the Sacraments both severally and jointly, Moral Regeneration attends upon Instrumental Baptism, ONLY when Baptism is *rightly* or *worthily* received. If this prerequisite be wanting: then there is *no* concomitancy of Regeneration.

Hence, in the case of Adults which we were first to consider, since an unworthy reception of Baptism is clearly quite possible, she indisputably teaches: that *The conferring of Moral Regeneration is* NOT *absolutely tied and limited to the administration of Outward Baptism.*

2. On the case of Infants, *Whether they may, or may not, receive Baptism unworthily, and thence without any moral or spiritual effect*, the Anglican Church, I believe, has no where, at least in so many precise words, given an absolute and positive decision. Hence we can only gather her sentiments upon this point in the way of fair and legitimate deduction.

It is often, on the old though untenable principle of the *Non-Presentation of an Impediment*,

with most illogical rapidity taken for granted: that *An Infant*, AS *such, cannot be an unworthy Recipient of Baptism;* and, consequently, that *Every baptised Infant must also have been morally regenerated.*

Against this notion, the Church of England distinctly protests: for, in her authorised Catechism she assures us; that *We are all*, BY NATURE, *born in sin and the children of wrath.*

Persons, so circumstanced *by nature*, cannot be *worthy* Recipients of Baptism: for, to predicate *worthiness* of persons so circumstanced by nature, is to assert a flat contradiction.

Therefore, in the judgment of the Church of England, all Infants, simply *as* Infants and *without* any antecedent operation to *make* them worthy, are *unworthy* Recipients of Baptism.

What, then, is this antecedent operation, through which the *naturally unworthy* are judged to be made *spiritually worthy?*

In the Article, she speaks of Faith and Grace, as *already* existing in worthy adult candidates *previous* to Baptism, and thence as being capable of confirmation and increase *through* Baptism by virtue of their prayer to God: and, in the Catechism, she requires of *all* persons to be baptised, whether Adults or Infants, Repentance and Faith*. This preparatory ingraftation of incipient holiness,

* What is required of persons to be baptised?
Repentance, whereby they forsake sin: and Faith, whereby

without which *no* child of fallen Adam could be *in himself* a worthy Recipient, the English Church demands as an essential prerequisite on the part of *all* who are candidates for Baptism: and it is morally parallel and similar to the quickening of an unborn child in the womb preparatory to its natural birth; for, as the imperfect physical life of the child is confirmed and increased by its natural birth, so the imperfect spiritual life of the worthy candidate is confirmed and increased by his spiritual birth instrumentally effected through his right reception of the External Sacrament *. But, if such preparatory ingraftation be demanded of *all*, in order to their being *made* worthy: then, of course, it is demanded, on the part of Infants, as well as on the part of Adults; and the sole difference in the two cases will be, that the preparatory ingraftation is, as the Schoolmen speak, *according to the Measure of the Recipient* †.

they stedfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that Sacrament. Catech. of the Anglican Church.

This exactly corresponds with the recorded catechumenical instruction employed by St. Paul, preparatory to the admission of converts to the Rite of Baptism.

I have taught you publicly and from house to house, testifying, both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. Acts xx. 20, 21.

* See above, book ii. chap. 5, § II. note.

† Juxta modum recipientis. Though an Infant, in *practical* strictness of speech, is incapable of *exercising* preparatory Faith

The settlement of this question serves only to land us upon a previous question. For it now makes the sole question to be: *Whether, in the judgment of the Anglican Church,* ALL *Infants, or only* SOME *Infants, are made worthy Recipients by a prevenient act of the Holy Spirit; the necessity of which prevenient act, in* EVERY *case alike and equally, cannot possibly be denied save on the broad principle of gross Pelagianism.*

3. This specific question, touching Infants, the English Church, I apprehend, has left undecided: but still, in a very remarkable manner, she has provided for cases, whether of Adults or of Infants, which agreeably to the tenor of her own statements, *might* be thought occasionally to occur.

What, if either an Adult or an Infant receives

and Repentance like an Adult; this circumstance no more precludes the possibility of a moral preparation of the soul by which a *born* child of wrath might *become* a worthy Recipient of Baptism, than it precludes, what all admit and what some maintain to be exhibited in *every* instance of Infant-Baptism, the possibility of a Moral Regeneration itself; for, if an Infant be capable of bearing the moral taint of Original Sin, which none save Pelagians deny, there is no reason why it should not be equally capable of bearing an inward moral Improvement. In refusing to Infants the capability of Conversion or Moral Regeneration, on the ground that they cannot believe with the heart unto righteousness and confess with the mouth unto salvation, Augustine, so far as I can perceive, goes further than he is warranted either by Scripture or by Scriptural Analogy.

Baptism *unworthily;* and thence, by the statements, *fails* of receiving, through that particular mean, the Inward Grace of Moral Regeneration? Does the Anglican Church make any provision for this certainly very possible contingency?

One of the Articles, which I have cited, may, on the first inspection, appear to give a somewhat fearful answer to the question: inasmuch as it speaks of unworthy Recipients of either Sacrament purchasing to themselves *damnation*. But, even to say nothing of the true import of the word as employed by St. Paul to express only temporal visitations, common equity of exposition binds us to conclude, that those alone can be exhibited as final sufferers, who, after unworthy reception of Baptism, are finally impenitent. Any other construction would inevitably bring out the result: that all, who, by unworthiness of reception, had *failed* of obtaining Moral Regeneration through Baptism, could never *hereafter* obtain it; and, consequently, since Christ has declared the impossibility of entering into the kingdom of God *without* Moral Regeneration, that all, who had *thus failed*, must also, by a plain necessity, *fail* of ever obtaining eternal salvation.

Thus, somewhat on the principle of a *Reductio ad absurdum*, we may fairly, I think, argue from the Article. But, however this may be, the existence, in the English Church, of an intended

provision for unworthy Recipients of Baptism, is sufficiently, though tacitly, established by the remarkable grammatical phraseology employed in the Catechism.

What meanest thou by this word SACRAMENT?

I mean an Outward and Visible Sign of an Inward and Spiritual Grace given unto us; ordained by Christ himself, as A *mean whereby we receive the same, and as* A *pledge to assure us thereof.*

Why not THE *mean* and THE *pledge?*

Truly, had *this* form, the *definite* form to wit, been used, the conferring of Regeneration would have been restricted to the SOLE instrumental mean of Outward Baptism: and the result would have been, that, in the declared judgment of the Church of England, they, who from UNWORTHY Reception had *failed* of being regenerated through the instrumental mean of Baptism, could never *afterward* be regenerated, and thence were inevitably excluded from all possibility of entering into the kingdom of heaven. But *another* form, the *indefinite* form to wit, is used: A *mean* and A *pledge.* Hence, quite agreeably to Scripture and quite in accordance with the testimony of Augustine to the judgment of the Primitive Church, the Church of England virtually determines: that *Baptism is not the* SOLE *instrumental mean of Regeneration.* What she *further* alluded to as ANOTHER mean, by her studied and twice repeated use of the *indefinite* rather than the *definite* article, we are

not left merely to guess: the martyred Bishop Latimer, in his plain and homely manner, informs us, incidentally indeed, but with abundant explicitness.

The Preaching of the Gospel is the Power of God to every man, that doth believe. Paul means: that GOD'S WORD OPENED *is the instrument and the thing, whereby ye are saved. Beware, beware, that ye diminish not this office: for, if ye do, ye decay God's Power to them that believe. Christ saith, consonant to the same:* Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. *He must have a Regeneration. And what is this Regeneration? It is not to be christened in water (as those firebrands do expound it*), and* NOTHING ELSE. *How is it to be expounded then? St. Peter sheweth, that one place of Scripture declareth ano-*

* By *firebrands*, Latimer means *the Popish Priests*. These taught the strange superstitious doctrine, that *The Sacraments, by their bare administration, mechanically, or* (as it was expressed) *ex opere operato, communicated their inward grace to all recipients:* and this doctrine had been ruled by the Council of Trent to be Scriptural Truth at the very commencement of the reign of Edward VI; for Henry VIII died Jan. 28. 1547; and the seventh Session of the Council, when the rule was made, opened March 3. 1547.

The Canon in question ran as follows.

Si quis dixerit, per ipsa Novæ Legis Sacramenta EX OPERE OPERATO non conferri gratiam, sed solam Fidem divinæ promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere: anathema sit. Concil. Trident. sess. vii. can. 8. p. 85.

ther *. *It is the circumstance and collation of places, that maketh Scripture plain. Saith St. Peter:* We be born again. *How? Not by a mortal seed, but by an immortal. What is this immortal seed?* By THE WORD OF THE LIVING GOD: *by* THE WORD OF GOD PREACHED AND OPENED. *Thus cometh in our New Birth* †.

To the *Word of God*, then, as ANOTHER appointed mean of Regeneration, should the mean of *Baptism* have unhappily failed through the unworthiness of the Recipient, the Church of England, I have little doubt, had respect, when she twice industriously used the indefinite article rather than the definite. *Baptism*, in her judgment, is A mean; but it is not THE mean: that is to say, it is not the ONLY mean. As Latimer justly states, ANOTHER mean is *The Word of the Living God preached and opened.*

Such are the cautions and restrictions, with which, in her Articles explained and corroborated by her Catechism, the Church of England guards her *generic* phraseology, lest it should be mischievously understood as *specific*.

II. Let us next follow the Anglican Church to her Liturgy.

We have seen her providing a *generic* prayer, formed on the charitable assumption: that all the

* By *declareth*, Latimer means *makes clear*. He explains himself in the next sentence.

† Latimer's Sermons, vol. i. p. 72.

baptised, in a whole Congregation of worshippers, having been worthy or right Recipients of Baptism, are *therefore* morally regenerate. In the way of implied explanation and limitation, we may next observe her care, in providing prayers, constructed upon a directly opposite supposition: the supposition to wit, that *some*, not being already regenerated, may still have need to supplicate God for the Inward Grace of Moral Regeneration.

Almighty God, who madest thy blessed Son to be circumcised and obedient to the Law for man: grant us THE TRUE CIRCUMCISION OF THE SPIRIT; *that, our hearts and all our members being mortified from all worldly and carnal lusts, we may in all things obey thy blessed will, through the same thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord* *.

Almighty and everlasting God, who hatest nothing that thou hast made, and dost forgive the sins of all them that are penitent, CREATE AND MAKE IN US NEW AND CONTRITE HEARTS; *that we, worthily lamenting our sins and acknowledging our wretchedness, may obtain of thee, the God of all mercy, perfect remission and forgiveness, through Jesus Christ our Lord* †.

Here we are taught to pray, for the *True Circumcision of the Spirit*, and for the *Creation within us of a New Heart*. In other words, to prevent

* Collect for the Circumcision of Christ.

† Collect for Ash-Wednesday.

those from despairing who have but too much reason to fear that they have failed in obtaining Moral Regeneration through the instrumental mean of Baptism, the English Church provides for them *specifically* two appropriate prayers: and thus expresses her own conviction, that, through another mean, the hope of still obtaining the *Internal Creation of a New Heart* is held out to them in Holy Scripture.

That, by the *New Creation of the Heart* and by the *True Circumcision of the Spirit*, our Church must have intended *Moral Regeneration*, is abundantly clear from the strict and studied parallelism of her language.

Moral Regeneration she defines to be: *A Death unto Sin, and a New Birth unto Righteousness.*

True Circumcision of the Spirit she defines to be: *A Mortification of our Hearts and Members from all worldly and carnal lusts, and an Obedience in all things to the Blessed Will of God.*

And New Creation of the Heart she defines to be: *A Making of New and Contrite Hearts within us.*

Now, between the two first of these definitions, there is scarcely even a *verbal* difference: and the third evidently involves the *sense* of the other two.

Hence, with such circumstances of palpable identity of import, there cannot be a shadow of reasonable doubt, that, *specifically* as opposed to

generically, Moral Regeneration or a Moral Change of Heart and Disposition is the grace prayed for in the two several Collects for the Circumcision and for Ash-Wednesday.

Indeed, the Anglican Church herself distinctly tells us, how we ought to understand the ancient symbolical Circumcision under the Law.

Circumcision, she theologises with the entire Primitive Church, *was a Sacrament: which preached, unto the outward senses, the Inward Cutting away of the Foreskin of the Heart; and which sealed and made sure, in the hearts of the circumcised, the promise of God touching the promised Seed that they looked for* *.

* Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments. Homil. book ii. p. 297. In annexing such a sense to *Circumcision*, the Anglican Church, agreeably to her fixed principle, has only followed the universal judgment of the Primitive Church, from Justin Martyr downward. See above, book ii. chap. 3. § II. 1.

It is a somewhat amusing circumstance: that the Infallible Church of Rome demands, on the one hand, the admission of no interpretation of Scripture save that which is propounded by the unanimous consent of the Fathers; and, on the other hand, anathematises all, who, with Justin, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Augustine, teach, that *Circumcision under the Law was a Sacrament of the same moral purport as Baptism under the Gospel*. Truly, your thorough-going cursers ought to be men both of extensive reading and of specially good memories.

Sacram Scripturam, juxta eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet Sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et

This account of the *Sacrament or Mystery of Circumcision* differs not a whit from the account of the *Sacrament or mystery of Baptism* as given in the Article. Each alike, under a different outward form, is the *Sacrament of Regeneration*, as Augustine speaks: and, as the same Father teaches us from the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, *Conversion*, the Mystery of which *preceded* in the body, may be hoped to follow *afterward* in the heart, if it had not *previously* attended upon the External Ordinance.

III. We may next attend to the explanation, which, very much at large, the Church of England has afforded to us in one of her authorised Homilies.

Where the Holy Ghost worketh, there nothing is

interpretatione Sacrarum Scripturarum, admitto: nec eam unquam, nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum, accipiam, et interpretabor. Profess. Fid. Trident. ex Bulla Pii Papæ IV. Syllog. Confess. p. 4.

Si quis dixerit, ea ipsa Novæ Legis Sacramenta a Sacramentis Antiquæ Legis non differre, nisi quia ceremoniæ sunt aliæ, et alii ritus externi: anathema sit. Concil. Trident. sess. vii. can. 2. p. 84.

Thus do the learned Theologians of Trent roundly curse the good old Fathers in the lump: and then, without so much as wiping their mouths, impose it upon their Clergy never to interpret Scripture save according to their unanimous consent. These are some of the manifold blessings and conveniences of that wondrous Infallibility, which we, the less privileged members of the Reformed Churches, are constrained to do without.

impossible; as may further appear by the Inward Regeneration and Sanctification of mankind.

When Christ said to Nicodemus; Unless a man be born anew of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God: *he was greatly amazed in his mind, and began to reason with Christ; demanding, how a man might be born which was old.* Can he enter, *saith he,* into his mother's womb again, and so be born anew?

Behold a lively pattern of a fleshly and carnal man. He had little or no intelligence of the Holy Ghost: and, therefore, he goeth bluntly to work; and asketh, how this thing were possible to be true. Whereas, otherwise, if he had known the great power of the Holy Ghost in this behalf, that it is he which inwardly worketh the Regeneration and New Birth of mankind, he would never have marvelled at Christ's words: but would rather have taken occasion thereby to praise and glorify God.

For, as there are three several und sundry Persons in the Deity, so have they three several and sundry offices proper unto each of them: the Father, to create; the Son, to redeem; the Holy Ghost, to sanctify and regenerate. Whereof the last, the more it is hid from our understanding, the more it ought to move all men to wonder at the secret and mighty working of God's Holy Spirit which is within us.

For it is the Holy Ghost, and no other thing, that doth quicken the minds of men: stirring up

good and godly motions in their hearts, which are agreeable to the will and commandment of God; such as, otherwise, of their own crooked and perverse nature, they should never have.

That, which is born of the flesh, *saith Christ,* is flesh: and that, which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.

As who should say: Man, of his own nature, is fleshly and carnal, corrupt and naught, sinful and disobedient to God, without any spark of goodness in him, without any virtuous or godly motion, only given to evil thoughts and wicked deeds. As for the works of the Spirit, the fruits of faith, charitable and godly motions, if he have any at all in him, they proceed only of the Holy Ghost: who is the only worker of our Sanctification, and maketh us new men in Christ Jesus.*

Did not God's Holy Spirit miraculously work in the child David: when, of a poor shepherd, he became a princely prophet? Did not God's Holy Spirit miraculously work in Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: when, of a proud publican,

* Can a person thus characterised, whether Infant or Adult, be a *worthy* Recipient of Baptism, without a previous act of moral *preparation* which should *fit* him to receive the holy Sacrament *rightly* and *worthily?* So far as I can judge, the common allegation, that *An Infant, as such, cannot present any impediment of Moral Unworthiness to the right Reception of Baptism,* is utterly irreconcileable with this statement propounded by the Church of England.

he became a humble and lowly evangelist? And who can choose but marvel, to consider: that Peter should become, of a simple fisher, a chief and mighty Apostle; Paul, of a cruel and bloody persecutor, a faithful disciple of Christ to teach the Gentiles?

*Such is the power of the Holy Ghost, to regenerate men, and, as it were, to bring them forth anew: so that they shall be nothing like the men that they were before *.*

Neither doth he think it sufficient inwardly to work the Spiritual and New Birth of man, unless he do also dwell and abide in him.

Know ye not, *saith St. Paul*, that ye are the temple of God, and that his Spirit dwelleth in you? know ye not, that your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost which is within you? *Again he saith:* You are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit. For why? The Spirit of God dwelleth in you.

To this agreeth the doctrine of St. John, writing on this wise. The anointing, which ye have received (*he meaneth the Holy Ghost*), dwelleth in you.

* Here, in opposition to those Theologians who adopt the restrictive Nomenclature recommended by Dr. Waterland, the Anglican Church, instead of confining the idea of Regeneration to a *Federal Change of Condition*, unequivocally makes its principal and primary and inherently essential idea to be that of a *Moral Change of Disposition*. See above, book i. chap. 1. § 1. 1. In this she accurately follows Scripture, as Scripture was received and understood by the Primitive Church. See above, book i. chap. 2, 3.

And the doctrine of St. Peter saith the same, who hath these words: The Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you.

O what comfort is this to the heart of a true Christian, to think that the Holy Ghost dwelleth within him! If God be with us, as the Apostle saith, who can be against us?

O but how shall I know, that the Holy Ghost is within me? some man perchance will say.

Forsooth, as the tree is known by his fruit, so is also the Holy Ghost. The fruits of the Holy Ghost, according to the mind of St. Paul, are these: love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance. Contrariwise, the deeds of the flesh are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, wantonness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, debate, emulation, wrath, contention, sedition, heresy, envy, murder, drunkenness, gluttony, and such like.

Here is now that glass, wherein thou must behold thyself; and discern, whether thou have the Holy Ghost within thee or the spirit of the flesh.

If thou see, that thy works be virtuous and good, consonant to the prescript rule of God's word, savouring and tasting not of the flesh but of the Spirit: then assure thyself, that thou art endued with the Holy Ghost. Otherwise, in thinking well of thyself, thou dost nothing else but deceive thyself.*

* Sermon for Whitsunday i. Homil. book ii. p. 389—391.

1. In this very important passage, we have, if I mistake not, a full and luminous explanation of what may be called the Systematic *Rationalè* of the Church of England.

Generically and *officially*, she recognises, as regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, all, who have given, to the *Legitimate Interrogation*, what she charitably believes to be the *Answer of a good conscience toward God:* for she herself, who claims not to be an infallible reader of the secret heart and hidden cogitations of man, does not presume to say *specifically*, that this or that particular individual has *not* been regenerated in Baptism.

But her plan is entirely and remarkably changed, when, in a sermon, she solemnly appeals to the conscience of the individuals *themselves*. She then calls upon each baptised person *specifically* to prove and examine his own self, by those tests of Regeneration, which have been divinely laid down by St. John, and which have been incidentally pointed out by St. Paul under the aspect of the fruits of the Spirit and the works of the flesh. Officially *she* will not judge him: but she exhorts him, not lightly and after the manner of a dissembler with God, to judge *himself*. The glass of the Gospel she holds up before his eyes; and, after having fully described what Moral Regeneration really is, she plainly tells him, that, by his inward Disposition and his outward Practice, he

must determine, whether he has or has not received the Holy Ghost, in other words, whether he has or has not been spiritually and morally regenerated. To these she refers him, as affording the only sure evidence of his New Creation: and she concludes with assuring him; that he does but deceive himself, if, *without* such evidence of his Regeneration, he ventures to think well of his religious condition *.

In regard to the reasoning of the Church of England, we cannot but be struck with its exact similitude to that of Augustine. She argues onward to the certainty of a man's Regeneration, from the tangible fact of his bringing forth the distinctly enumerated fruits of the Spirit: and Augustine, in like manner, when commenting upon the unequivocal declarations of St. John, requires each individual to test his Regeneration by the moral evidence of its reality. *They, who have charity*, says he, *have been born of God: and they, who have it not, have not been born of God.*

2. There is yet another point, which is highly deserving of our attention.

* In her official declaration at the Baptismal Font, she speaks *generically:* in her hortatory address to each baptised individual's conscience, she speaks *specifically;* leaving, however, the application to the individual himself. I have already, in a preceding note, briefly discussed this indisputable principle of the Anglican Church. See above, book iv. chap. 3. in init. note.

In exemplifying the doctrine of Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, the Church of England indifferently alleges, David from the Old Testament, and Matthew and Peter and Paul from the New Testament. By this *double* selection of instances, therefore, she plainly declares: that, although, in the *one* case, the Outward Sign was Circumcision, while, in the *other* case, it was Baptism; yet the Inward Grace of Regeneration *itself* was communicated, under the imperfect Law, as well as under the more perfect Gospel.

Nor, indeed, in the very nature of things, could it be otherwise. For the necessity of Moral Regeneration is built, not upon the peculiarity of *this* Dispensation or of *that* Dispensation, but upon the circumstance of the Fall itself and the consequent Universal Apostasy of Mankind.

I may remark, that no example from the Old Testament could have been more felicitously chosen than that of David: for he both places the doctrine upon its only true foundation, and sets it forth in the very phraseology of the Gospel.

Behold, I was shapen in iniquity: and, in sin, did my mother conceive me. Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts: and, in that which is hidden, thou shalt make me to know wisdom. Purge me with hyssop; and I shall be clean: wash me; and I shall be whiter than snow. Make me to hear joy and gladness: that the bones, which thou hast broken, may rejoice. Hide thy face from my sins:

*and blot out all mine iniquities. Create in me a clean heart, O God: and renew a right spirit within me**.

IV. Let us now turn to those other Documents: which have received, as it has been noted, the formal sanction of the Church of England; and which, therefore, by adoption, she has made her own.

1. Thus, in the first instance, we may advert to king Edward's Catechism.

If we be dead, if we be buried, to sin: how shall we hereafter live in the same? If we be risen again with Christ; if, by stedfast hope, we live now in heaven with him: heavenly and godly things, not earthly and frail, we ought to set our care upon. And, even as, heretofore, we have borne the image of the earthly man: so, from henceforward, let us bear the image of the heavenly †.

Baptism is also a figure of our Burial in Christ, and that we shall be raised up again with him in a New Life: as I have before declared in Christ's Resurrection ‡.

The latter of these two cited passages avowedly refers to the former.

Hence, we undeniably learn: that, by *a Death and Burial unto Sin*, and by *a Resurrection with Christ unto Righteousness*, the writer of the Cate-

* Psalm li. 5—10.

† King Edward's Catech. in Enchir. Theol. vol. i. p. 37.

‡ King Edward's Catech. in Enchir. Theol. vol. i. p. 52.

chism indisputably meant, that *Moral Regeneration* of which Baptism was an appointed mean of conveyance.

Yet, how does he here treat the question, when he makes it assume the form of a *specific* appeal to each baptised individual's own conscience?

Truly, he exhibits the matter altogether hypothetically. *If* we have been regenerated in Baptism: *then* we can no longer live in allowed and habitual sin.

Consequently, *if* we are living in allowed and habitual sin: *then* we are but self-deceivers, when we flatter ourselves that we have assuredly been regenerated in Baptism.

Exactly the same test is referred to, as that propounded by St. John and commented upon by Augustine and the Writer of the Homily for Whitsunday.

2. Thus, again, we may advert to the authorised Apology of Bishop Jewel.

We believe: that the Holy Spirit, who is the third Person of the Blessed Trinity, is truly God; neither made, nor created, nor begotten; but proceeding, after an ineffable manner, from both the Father and the Son. It is his office, to soften the hardness of the human heart, when, either by the Wholesome Preaching of the Gospel, or through Any Other Channel, he is received into the breasts of men. He illuminates them: and thus brings them, to the knowledge of God, to the entire way

of truth, to Newness of the Whole Life, and to a perpetual hope of salvation *

More in the language of a scholar than was the wont of good Bishop Latimer, the accomplished Apologist of the Church of England sets forth, nevertheless, precisely the same doctrine.

Instead of pronouncing *Baptism* the *sole* mean through which the Spirit of God communicates the Inward Grace of Moral Regeneration: he teaches us, in exact accordance with the joint apostolic decision of St. Paul and St. James and St. Peter, that the Holy Ghost *also* operates the same benefit, either through the *Wholesome Preaching of the Gospel*, or through *Any other Channel* †.

* Credimus, Spiritum Sanctum, qui est tertia Persona in Sacra Triade, illum verum esse Deum; non factum, non creatum, non genitum; sed ab utroque, Patre scilicet et Filio, ratione quadam mortalibus incognita et ineffabili, procedentem. Illius esse duritiem humani cordis emollire; cum, aut per salutiferam prædicationem Evangelii, aut alia quacunque ratione, in pectora hominum recipitur: illum eos illuminare; et, in agnitionem Dei, atque in omnem viam veritatis, et in totius vitæ Novitatem, et perpetuam salutis spem, perducere. Juell. Apol. Eccles. Anglican. in Enchir. Theol. vol. i. p. 207.

† 1 Corinth. iv. 15. James i. 18. 1 Peter i. 3, 23. On the last of these texts, Archbishop Leighton theologises most excellently and at great length. A few extracts will not be inappropriate and may be acceptable.

If God's sovereign will be not a sufficient principle of this Regeneration, why then says the Apostle St. James: *Of his own will begat he us?* And he adds the subordinate cause; *By the word of God:* which is here called the immortal seed

As to whether he was speaking of *Moral Regeneration*, he most effectually precludes any doubt by his studied and theologically learned phraseology.

The Spirit, says he, *through the Wholesome Preaching of the Gospel*, ILLUMINATES *them*.

Now, in the technical language of the Early Church, Regeneration was styled *Illumination*.

of this New Birth. Therefore it is, that the Lord hath appointed the continuance of the ministry of this word, to the end that his Church may be still fruitful, bringing forth sons unto him.—Though the ministers of this word, by reason of their employment in dispensing it, have by the Scriptures the relation of parents imparted to them:—yet the privilege of the Father of spirits remains untouched; which is, effectually to beget again these same spirits which he created, and to make that seed of the word, that way, where, and when, he will. The preacher of the word, be he never so powerful, can cast this seed only into the ear; his hand reaches no further: and the hearer, by his attention, may convey it into his head. But it is the supreme Father and Teacher above, that carries it into the heart: the only soil, wherein it proves lively and fruitful. One man cannot reach the heart of another: how should he, then, renew its fruitfulness? If natural births have been always acknowledged to belong to God's prerogative:—how much more is this New Birth wholly dependent on his hand. But, though this word cannot beget without him: yet it is by this word that he begets; and, ordinarily, not without it. Comment on 1 Peter i. 23. vol. i. p. 179, 180.

I have often marvelled at the technicality of that Theology, which, notwithstanding the plainest apostolical declarations, resolutely determines Baptism to be the *sole* channel through which Moral Regeneration is communicated.

Accordingly, while our Anglican Apologist carefully *uses* the theologically classical term: he has duly, in the way of explanation, informed us what he *means* by it. With him, as with the Primitive Church, *Illumination* is *Spiritual Newness of Life.*

3. Finally, we may advert, still for the purpose of receiving the explanation of the Church of England, to the similarly authorised Catechism of Dean Nowel.

Whence have we Regeneration?

From no other source, than from the death and resurrection of Christ. For, by the force of his death, our Old Man is crucified and mortified: while, through the benefit of his resurrection, we are formed again to Newness of Life and to a Holy Obedience to the Righteousness of God.

Do all, commonly and promiscuously, attain to this grace?

Such fruit is received by the faithful alone. As for the unfaithful, by slighting the promises of God, they preclude their own admission, and go away empty. Yet, by reason of their culpability, the Sacraments lose not their force and nature.*

All, we see, attain not to the grace of Regeneration through Baptism, when their several cases

* Regenerationem vero unde habemus?

Non aliunde, quam a morte et resurrectione Christi. Nam, per mortis suæ vim, vetus homo noster quodam modo crucifigitur et mortificatur: et naturæ nostræ vitiositas quasi sepelitur, ne amplius in nobis vivat et vigeat. Resurrectionis vero

come to be *specifically* considered. The benefit is limited to *the faithful* exclusively.

V. I may add, that, in succession downward, the same explanation is given by some of our ablest and soundest Divines, much in the same manner as a similar explanation of the

suæ beneficio nobis largitur, ut in Novam Vitam, ad obediendum Dei justitiæ, reformemur.

An gratiam hanc omnes, communiter et promiscuè, consequentur?

Soli fideles hunc fructum percipiunt: increduli vero, oblatas illic a Deo promissiones respuendo, aditum sibi præcludentes, inanes abeunt. Non tamen id efficiunt, ut suam sacramenta vim et naturam amittant. Noell. Catech. in Enchir. Theol. vol. ii. p. 215.

This is the precise doctrine of Augustine, whom the learned Dean most probably had in his eye when he wrote this portion of his Catechism.

Quia per se ipsa (scil. sanctificatio sacramenti) consideranda est, excepta salute hominis cui perficiendæ adhibetur, satis indicat: quod, et in malis, et in eis qui sæculo, verbis non factis, renunciant, ipsa integra est; cum illi, nisi corrigantur, salutem habere non possint. August. de Baptism. cont. Donat. lib. iv. c. 23. Oper. vol. vii. p. 52.

Hæc eadem sacramenta, et in bonis hominibus illius temporis, erant, et in pejoribus quam sint ethnici: et tamen illa sacramenta erant in utrisque integra atque divina. Ibid. lib. vi. c. 44. p. 68.

Non dicunt ergo ista, nisi qui aqua sancta reficiuntur, sicut omnes justi Dei; non qui ea malè utendo subvertuntur, sicut magus ille a Philippo baptizatus: et tamen ipsa, in utrisque, una et sancta est. August. cont. Liter. Petilian. lib. iv. c. 47. Oper. vol. vii. p. 97.

similar generic language of the Primitive Church is given by a succession of the ancient Fathers.

Among these, downward from the martyred Cranmer and Latimer and Hooper, to whom many more might easily be added, I may enumerate, Bishop Hall, Archbishop Usher, the Judicious Hooker, Bishop Reynolds, Bishop Hopkins, Bishop Pearson, Bishop Wilkins, Bishop Burnet, Dr. Isaac Barrow, Bishop Butler, Archbishop Tillotson, and, in our own times, Bishop Horsley and Bishop Barrington *.

In giving such an explanation, these eminent men perfectly fall in with the explanation of the primitive Church and subsequently with the authorised explanation of the Church of England.

When, in consequence of receiving a satisfactory *Answer*, the Church, whether ancient or modern, declares each baptised person to have been regenerated: *then* she speaks officially and therefore generically.

But, when, on the other hand, she explains her words, so as to restrict them personally to worthy and fit Recipients: *then* she speaks warningly and therefore specifically.

* Passages, extracted from the Works of these writers, are given below at full length in the Appendix. To say nothing of many others, I may add to the catalogue Whitby and Pyle and Leighton. But these three Divines have already been cited. See above, book ii. chap. 2. § II. 3. (2.) note: and book iv. chap. 3. § IV. 2. note.

CHAPTER IV.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

I SHALL now give a General Summary of the whole Investigation: and then attempt to bring the matter to somewhat of a Practical Conclusion.

I. The Result of the present Inquiry into the true sense of Holy Scripture, as attested by Primitive Antiquity, touching the Doctrine of Regeneration, may be thus briefly summed up.

1. Regeneration is not merely a *Federal Change of Condition*, by which, through Baptism, an individual is translated from the wilderness of the World into the inclosed garden of the Church, with the remission of sins and a covenanted right to all the blessings and privileges of the Gospel. But it is, furthermore, a *Moral Change of Disposition*, distinct from though associated with such *Federal Change of Condition:* Outward Baptism being one of the appointed channels,

through which the Inward Grace of Moral Regeneration is conveyed.

2. The necessity of Moral Regeneration resting altogether upon the Apostasy of men occasioned by the Fall, the *same* Change or Conversion of Heart, by whatever Outward Sign it might be represented to the senses, must, in *every* age, have been alike requisite toward the attainment of everlasting salvation.

Hence, the declaration of our Lord, that, *Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, is not a mere arbitrary or positive enactment, analogous to the enactments of the ancient Ritual Law or to the probationary prohibition of a particular fruit to our first parents in Paradise: but it is an enactment, founded upon an eternal Moral Necessity; which Necessity, in the particular case of man, has subsisted, ever since his heart became alienated from God and true holiness.

3. On this principle of a *Moral Necessity*, strongly expressed by Christ in the asseveration *Ye* MUST *be born from above*, the Circumcision of the Heart under the Law, represented by the Outward Sign of Circumcision in the flesh, is virtually and really the same, as Moral Regeneration under the Gospel, represented by the Outward Sign of Baptism in Water.

4. A Moral Change of Disposition, then, being the matter intended and required, such Moral

Change is, in Scripture, variously designated by sundry different parallel and synonymous appellations: as, for instance, *Regeneration; New Birth; Birth from above; Birth of the Spirit; Conversion of the Heart; Renovation; New Creation; Putting off the Old Man and putting on the New Man; Illumination; Passing from Moral Darkness into Moral Light; Resurrection from the Death of Sin to the Life of Righteousness; Formation of Christ within a person; Being Begotten again to become the Sons of God; Circumcision of the Heart in the Spirit.*

Of these terms, *Renovation*, when described as the *Renovation of the Inward Man from day to day*, is obviously used to express that Progressive Sanctification or that Growth in Grace, which constitutes the gradual healthy development and expansion of the germ of Spiritual Life, implanted, at the time of, or in preparation for, an individual's Moral Regeneration: but, save with this explanatory adjunct, *Renovation* and *Regeneration* are identical; and, accordingly, by the ancient writers, we find them constantly employed as synonymns.

Much the same remark applies to the term *Conversion*. In a wide sense, it may be used to express *every* turning from evil to good, which a lapse into sin has rendered necessary. But, strictly and properly, as we find from Augustine, *Conversion of the Heart* is the very same as *Moral Regeneration:* inasmuch as each alike is attested

by that Father to be the *Inward Grace*, whereof the Mystery or Sacrament of Baptism is the antecedent *Outward Sign*.

5. Three several means or channels are propounded and recognised in Holy Scripture, through which, according to God's sovereign pleasure, this Moral Change of Disposition is communicated: *Baptism;* the *Revealed Word of God;* and a *Believing Reception of Christ*.

6. Such being the case, Moral Regeneration may be, and is, communicated, either before Baptism, or in Baptism, or after Baptism: God reserving, in his own hands, and for the better display of the mighty power of his life-giving Spirit, the time when this so necessary Conversion or Renovation of Heart should be conveyed to an heir of salvation.

7. Under these circumstances, certain tests are fitly and reasonably proposed: by which a man may prove and examine his own self, whether he have indeed received the Inward Grace of Moral Regeneration, or whether he be still in the original condition of his Innate Naturalism and Carnality. Such tests are distinctly proposed in Scripture: and, as we learn from Augustine, were fully recognised and duly employed by the Early Church. Their value is inestimable: for they act, both evidentially, and practically.

(1.) In the way of evidence, they demonstrate, even were all other demonstration wanting: that

Moral Regeneration is not ALWAYS *the concomitant of Outward Baptism.* For, if *every* baptised person were thence assuredly *also* regenerated: it were nugatory to look, beyond the fact of his Baptism, for a proof of his Moral Regeneration.

(2.) In the way of practice, they hold out to us a most important lesson, as to what a professed Christian ought to be, in order that he may really be made a Child of God and thus be morally fitted for the inheritance of the Saints in light.

If ye know, that God is righteous: ye know, that every one, that doeth righteousness, is born of him.

Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the Sons of God. Therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.

Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin: for God's seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this, the Children of God are manifest, and the Children of the Devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness, is not of God; neither he that loveth not his brother.

He, that keepeth his commandments, dwelleth in him; and he, in him: and hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.

Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God: and every one, that loveth him that begat, loveth him also that is begotten of him. By this we know that we love the Children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments. For

this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous. For, whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the world: and this is the victory, that overcometh the world; even our faith.

We know, that, whosoever is born of God, sinneth not: but he, that is begotten of God, keepeth himself; and that wicked one toucheth him not.

II. Perhaps, in Conclusion, and with these divine precepts sounding in our ears, I may be allowed, at once to enforce the necessity of our proceeding from theological discussion to diligent self-examination, and to beseech those whose theoretical sentiments respecting Baptism and Regeneration are not precisely the same, to put away from them the bitter feelings too often engendered by controversy.

1. In regard to *personal application*, whatever difference of opinion there may be between them as to the *Amount of the Concomitancy of Moral Regeneration upon Outward Baptism*, the sincerely pious man who adopts the tenet of *Inseparability*, and the equally pious man who is led to prefer the tenet of *Separability*, will fully and cordially agree. To the very same point, *Christian Holiness of Life and Conversation*, their admonitions, when such admonitions may be requisite, will be alike directed. They will have before them a common practical end, though they may not start from precisely the same principles.

(1.) The one will say: Though you have assuredly been regenerated in Baptism, yet may you, by a course of sin, pass through a state of increasing moral sickness, until at length you be consigned to the condition of a spiritual death from which there is no resurrection to a second spiritual life. *Remember from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works: or else the Lord will come unto thee quickly; and, except thou repent, will remove thy candlestick out of his place.*

(2.) The other will say: Though you confidently build upon your Regeneration in Baptism, yet beware, lest you be nothing more than a self-deceiver. The divinely specified badges of Regeneration are: a Conquest of sin; a Victory over the world: a Love of God and of the Brethren *as* the Brethren: a Vital and Practical Belief in Christ the Saviour. If you can produce none of these evidences, it may be scripturally doubted whether you have ever been regenerated. Summing them up in a single comprehensive word, *They, who have* CHARITY, says Augustine, *have been born of God: and they, who have it not, have not been born of God.* At all events, even upon your own principles, you have fallen away from your Baptismal Regeneration: and you are now, either in the dangerous lethargy of complacent self-delusion, or in the raging fever of overt sin and open rebellion. *Awake, thou that sleepest;*

and arise from the dead: and Christ shall give thee Illumination.

2. Of each of these admonitions, the *basis*, at least, is undoubtedly scriptural: and, whatever Doctrinal Scheme may be severally developed in them, there will be no difference of opinion as to their direct practical tendency.

If, then, the *end* be the same, even *the Turning of Souls from Satan unto God*, why should good men, who are alike in earnest touching religion (for I speak only of *such* characters), think or say unkind things of each other, merely because, after an honest examination of the question, the points, from which they variously set forth on their common labour of charity, are different?

To both classes of theologians, we surely may well apply the healing words of Scripture: *Sirs, ye are brethren: why do ye wrong, one to another?* Short, though arduous, is the journey before you: and you equally, in all sincerity, profess to be pilgrims, travelling to the same heavenly country. *See*, then *that ye fall not out by the way:* but rather, according to the apostolic injunction, *speaking the truth*, or what you severally believe to be the truth, *in love, grow up, in all things, into him which is the head, even Christ.*

APPENDIX.

STATEMENTS, TOUCHING BAPTISM AND REGENERATION, BY VARIOUS EMINENT ANGLICAN DIVINES, FROM THE TIME OF THE REFORMATION, DOWN TO THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

VARIOUS eminent Divines of the Church of England, from the time of our English Reformation down to the nineteenth century, while they hold Baptism to be the Sacrament of Regeneration, deny, nevertheless, the *necessary* and *invariable* concomitancy of the Inward Grace upon the Outward Sign.

I. I shall give sixteen instances: and more might very easily have been added.

1. Archbishop Cranmer.

In Baptism, those that come feignedly, and those that come unfeignedly, *both* be washed with the sacramental water, but *both* be *not* washed with the Holy Ghost and clothed with Christ. Defence of the Cath. Doctr. of the Sacram. of the Body and Blood of Christ. book iv. chap. 7. Works, vol. ii. p. 439. Edit. Jenkyns.

All, that be washed in the water, be *not* washed with the Holy Spirit. Answer to Gardiner. book iv. Works, vol. iii. p. 323.

2. Bishop Latimer.

What is this Regeneration? It is not to be christened in water, and *nothing else.*—Saith St. Peter: *We be born again.*

How? Not by a mortal seed, but by an immortal. What is this immortal seed? *By the Word of the liring God:* by the Word of God preached and opened. Thus cometh in our New Birth. Latimer's Serm. vol. i. p. 72.

3. Bishop Hooper.

There are two kinds of Baptism: and both, necessary. The one, *interior:* which is the cleansing of the heart, the drawing of the Father, the operation of the Holy Ghost; and *this* Baptism is in man, *when he believeth and trusteth that Christ is the only actor of his salvation.*—A traitor may receive the crown, and yet be true king nothing more. So a hypocrite and infidel may receive the *external* sign of Baptism, and yet be *no* christian man any more: as Simon Magus and others. Hooper, in Fathers of the English Church. vol. v. p. 169, 171.

4. Bishop Hall.

From our Creation, we may look to our Regeneration. If we be the sons of God, we are renewed. And how shall it appear, whether we *be* the sons of God? It is a golden rule: *Whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.* Yet, if, in both of these, life could be counterfeited; death cannot. *Mortify your members which are on earth.* There is a death of this body of sin: and what manner of death? *Those that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.* Lo, as impossible as it is for a dead man to come down from his gibbet or up from his coffin, and to do the works of his former life: so impossible is it, that a renewed man should do the works of his unregeneration. If, therefore, you find your hearts unclean, your hands idle and unprofitable, your ways crooked and unholy, your corruptions alive and lively: never pretend to *any renewing.* You are *the old man* still: and, however ye may go for Christians: yet ye have denied the power of Christianity in your lives. Serm. xx. Works, vol. v. p. 296. Edit. Pratt.

Abraham *first* believed to Justification: then, *after,* received the sign of Circumcision, as a seal of the righteousness of that faith which he had when he was uncircumcised. Therefore some, dying *before* their Baptism, may, yea must, be saved. Neither was Abraham's case singular. He was the father of all them also, which believe, not being circumcised. These, as

they are his sons in faith, so in righteousness, so in salvation. Uncircumcision cannot hinder, where faith admitteth. These, following his steps of belief *before* the Sacrament, shall doubtless rest in his bosom *without* the Sacrament; without it, as fatally absent, not as willingly neglected. *Who takes Baptism without a full Faith*, saith Jerome, *takes the water, takes not the Spirit.* Baptism, therefore, *without* Faith, cannot save a man: and, by Faith, doth save him. And Faith *without* Baptism, where it cannot be had, not where it may be had and is contemned, may save him. That Spirit, which works by means, will not be tied to means. Decad. v. Epist. 4. Works, vol. vii. p. 236, 237.

5. Archbishop Usher.

Is God *always* present, to give the thing signified to *all* them that the minister giveth the sign?

No, not to *all:* for some, in receiving the signs, receive, together with them, their own judgment.

Are *all* they, then, that are partakers of the Outward Washing of Baptism, partakers also of the Inward Washing of the Spirit? Doth this Sacrament seal up their Spiritual Ingraffing into Christ to *all* who externally receive it?

Surely, *no.* Though God hath ordained these outward means for the conveyance of the inward grace to our souls: yet there is no necessity, that we should tie the working of God's Spirit to the Sacraments more than to the word.

Doth the inward grace *always* accompany the outward sign in those of years baptised?

No: but only then, when the profession of their Faith is not outward only and counterfeit, but sincere and hearty.

But what say you of infants baptised, that are born in the Church? Doth the inward grace in their Baptism *always* attend upon the outward sign?

Surely, *no.* The Sacrament of Baptism is effectual in infants, only to those and to all those who belong unto the election of grace. Which thing, though we, in the judgment of charity, do judge of every particular infant; yet we have no ground to judge so of all in general: or, if we should judge so, it is not any judgment of certainty; we may be mistaken.—When God affordeth means, we must wait upon him for a blessing in them

and by them: when he doth not afford means, we must not tie the working of his grace to them. God, who sanctifieth some in the womb, knows how to sanctify all his elect infants and by his Spirit apply the merits of Christ unto them *without* the outward water. Some have the outward sign, and *not* the inward grace: some have the inward grace, and *not* the outward sign. We must not commit idolatry, by deifying the outward element. Body of Divinity. p. 385, 391, 392, 396.

6. Mr. Richard Hooker.

Seeing that grace is a consequent of Sacraments; a thing which accompanieth them as their end; a benefit which they have received from God himself the author of Sacraments, and not from any other natural or supernatural quality in them: it may be hereby both understood, that Sacraments are necessary, and that the manner of their necessity to life supernatural is not in all respects as food unto natural life, because they contain in themselves no vital force or efficacy. They are, not physical, but moral, instruments of salvation, duties of service and worship: which unless we perform as the author of grace requireth, they are unprofitable; for *all receive not the grace of God, which receive the Sacraments of his grace.* Eccles. Polit. book v. § 57. vol. ii. p. 239. Oxon.

The Law of Christ, which in these considerations maketh Baptism necessary, must be construed and understood according to rules of natural equity.—And, because equity so teacheth, it is on all parts gladly confessed, that there may be, in diverse cases, life by virtue of *Inward Baptism*, where *Outward* is *not* found.—Touching infants which die unbaptised, sith they neither have this Sacrament itself nor any sense or conceit thereof, the judgment of many hath gone hard against them, but yet, *seeing grace is not absolutely tied unto Sacraments*, remorse of equity hath moved diverse of the school-divines to grant: that God, all-merciful to such as are not in themselves able to desire Baptism, imputeth the secret desire that others have in their behalf, and accepteth the same as theirs rather than casteth away their souls for that which no man is able to help.—It is not to be thought, that he, which, as it were from heaven, hath nominated and designated them unto holiness by special privilege of their very birth, will himself *deprive* them of Regenera-

tion and Inward Grace, *only* because necessity *depriveth* them of Outward Sacraments. Ibid. book v. § 60. p. 250, 252, 253.

If Outward Baptism were a cause in *itself* possessed of that power, either natural or supernatural, *without* the present operation whereof no such effect could possibly grow: it must then follow, that, seeing effects do never prevent the necessary causes out of which they spring, *no man* could ever receive Grace *before* Baptism; which is apparently both known, and also confessed, to be *otherwise* in *many* particulars. Ibid. book v. § 60. p. 246, 247.

7. Bishop Reynolds.

Unregenerate men are often secure men, making principles and premises of their own to build the conclusions of their salvation upon. Sinfulness of Sin. Works, p. 46.

The *unregenerate* are of several sorts and stamps. Some are, apparently and *in conspectu hominum*, outrageous sinners: upon whom, every man, that sees them, may without breach of charity, pass this sentence; *There goes a man, who declares himself in the eyes of the world to be a servant of sin.* Others there are of a more calm, civil, composed, course: men, much wiser, but not a dram holier, than those before. In those men, there appeareth not so sovereign and absolute a dominion of sin as hath been spoken of, inasmuch as they seem to live in a fair external conformity to the truths which they have learned. These more moderate sort of *unregenerate* men seem to shift off from themselves the charge of being subject to the reign of sin, inasmuch as they abhor many sins, and do many things which the rule requires. The reign of Sin. Works, p. 111, 113.

8. Bishop Hopkins.

Very difficult it is to persuade men against the prejudices of their corrupt hearts. *This great Change*, say they, *is more than needs*. Regeneration begins now to be decried by as great masters in Israel, as ever Nicodemus was. Many understand not to what end the fabric of corrupt nature should be demolished, and men as it were turned out of themselves. They think, if they are but baptised, whereby, as they suppose, the guilt of original sin is washed away, that a sober religious life, keeping from gross actual sins, is sufficient for the obtaining of heaven, without those hard and inexplicable notions of Regene-

ration. *I shall therefore endeavour to convince you of the indispensable necessity that there is of being born again: that so, when you are persuaded of it, you may give no rest unto yourselves nor unto God, till he cause his Spirit, which is that wind that bloweth where it listeth, to breathe spiritual life into you; without which it is impossible, that you should inherit eternal life.* Serm. xii. Works. p. 535.

There is, indeed, a Baptismal Regeneration, whereby all, that are made partakers of that ordinance, are, according to Scripture language, sanctified, renewed, made the children of God, and brought within the bond of the covenant: but all this is but after an *external* manner, as being in this ordinance entered members of the Visible Church. Now this *external* Regeneration by water entitles none to eternal life, but as the Spirit moves upon the face of these waters, and doth *sometimes* secretly convey quickening virtue through them. Serm. xi. Works, p. 519.

The seminal virtue or mean, by which this New Birth is effected, is the word of God. So you have it expressly: *Of his own good will begat he us with the word of truth.* The preaching of the word is the great mean, which God hath appointed for Regeneration. *Faith cometh by hearing: and hearing, by the word of God.* When God first created man, it is said, that he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. But, when God new creates man, he breathes into his ears. This is that word, that raiseth the dead, calleth them out of the grave, opens the eyes of the blind, turns the hearts of the disobedient and rebellious. Such an energy is there in the word of God, when the Spirit of God clothes it with power, that it breaks in upon the conscience, ruinates and demolishes the frame of sinful nature, and in an instant conveys spiritual light and warmth and quickening into the soul. Serm. xii. Works, p. 533.

9. Bishop Pearson.

The second part of the office of the Holy Ghost is the Renewing of man in all the parts and faculties of his soul: as the first was an internal Illumination, by which we are inclined to the obedience of faith, in assenting to those truths, which, unto a natural and carnal man, are foolishness.—What the Apostle

wished to the Corinthians, ought to be the earnest petition of every Christian, that *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with us all.* For, *if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his:* if he have not that which maketh the union, he cannot be united; if he acknowledge him not to be his Lord, he cannot be his servant: and no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost. *That which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit;* such is their felicity that have it: *that, which is born of the flesh, is flesh;* such is their infelicity that want it. Exposition of Creed. art. viii. vol. i. p. 496, 499, 500. Oxon.

10. Bishop Wilkins.

We ought to pray unto God, that he would give unto us a New Heart, and put a New Spirit within us: that we *may be* regenerate and *become* new creatures, being born again of that incorruptible seed the Word of God. Treatise on Prayer. chap. xvii.

11. Bishop Burnet.

Baptism makes us the visible members of that one body, into which we are baptised or admitted by Baptism: but that, which saves us in it, which both deadens and quickens us, must be a thing of another nature.—This is not to be believed to be the nature of a charm, as if the very act of Baptism carried *always* with it an Inward Regeneration. Here we must confess, that very early some doctrines arose upon Baptism that we cannot be determined by.—One of these was the mixing of the outward and inward effects of Baptism: it being believed; that *every* person, who was born of the water, was *also* born of the Spirit; and that the Renewing of the Holy Ghost did *always* accompany the washing of Regeneration.—But Baptism is a Federal Admission into Christianity: in which, on God's part, all the blessings of the Gospel are made over to the baptised; and, on the other hand, the person baptised takes on him, by a solemn profession and vow, to observe and adhere to the whole Christian Religion. So that it is a very natural distinction to say: that the outward effects of Baptism follow it, as outwardly performed; but that the inward effects of it follow upon the inward acts. But this difference is still to be observed between inward acts and out-

ward actions: that, when the outward action is rightly performed, the Church must reckon the Baptism good, and never renew it; but, if any one has been *wanting* in the inward acts, these may be *afterward* renewed, and that *want* may be made up by (μετάνοια) repentance. Expos. of the xxxix. Articles. art. xxvii. p. 382—384. Oxon.

12. Dr. Isaac Barrow.

We are naturally void of those good dispositions in understanding and will and affections, which are needful to render us acceptable unto God, fit to serve and please him, capable of any favour from him and of any true happiness in ourselves. To remove which bad dispositions, and to beget those contrary to them, God in mercy doth grant to us the virtue of his Holy Spirit; who, first opening our hearts, begetteth divine knowledge and wisdom and faith in our minds: which is the work of Illumination and Instruction. Then, by continual impressions, he bendeth our inclinations, and mollifieth our hearts, and tempereth our affections, to a willing compliance with God's will and a hearty complacence in that which is good and pleasing to God: which is the work of Sanctification, another great part of his office. Both these operations together, Enlightening our minds and Sanctifying our wills and affections, do constitute and accomplish that work, which is styled the *Regeneration*, *Renovation*, *Vivification*, *New Creation*, *Resurrection* of a man: the faculties of our souls being so improved, that we become, as it were, other men thereby; able and apt to do that, for which before we were altogether indisposed and unfit. Works, vol. ii. p. 504.

13. Bishop Butler.

If mankind are corrupted and depraved in their moral character, and so are unfit for that state which Christ is gone to prepare for his disciples; and if the assistance of God's Spirit be necessary to renew their nature in the degree requisite to their being qualified for that state; all which is implied in the express though figurative declaration, *Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God:* supposing this, is it possible, that any serious person can think it a slight matter, whether or no he makes use of the means expressly commanded by God, for obtaining this divine assistance?

Especially, since the whole analogy of nature shews, that we are not to expect any benefits without making use of the appointed means for obtaining or enjoying them. Anal. part ii. chap. 1. § II. p. 225, 226.

14. Archbishop Tillotson.

The first sort, namely those who are brought to goodness by a religious and virtuous education: these make up a very considerable part of the number of the regenerate. And, though it be certain, considering the universal corruption and degeneracy of human nature, that there is a real Change made in them by the operation of God's grace upon their hearts: yet it is as certain in experience, that this change is made in very many by very silent and insensible degrees, till at length the seeds of religion, which were planted in them by a good education, do visibly prevail over all the evil inclinations of corrupt nature, so as to sway and govern the actions of their lives; and, *when the principles of grace and goodness do apparently prevail, we may conclude them to be in a regenerate state*, though perhaps very few of these can give any account of the particular time and occasion of this change. For many things may be seen in their *effect*, which were never very sensible in their *cause*. And it is very reasonable, that such persons, who never lived in any evil course, should escape those pangs and terrors, which unavoidably happen unto others from a course of actual sin and the guilt of a wicked life: and, if there be any such persons as I have described, who are in this gradual and insensible manner *regenerated* and *made good*, this is a demonstration, that there is no necessity that this change should be in an instant, it being so frequently found to be otherwise in experience.

And, as for others, who are visibly reclaimed from a notorious wicked course, in these we likewise frequently see this Change gradually made, by strong impressions made upon their minds most frequently by *the Word of God;* sometimes, by his providence, whereby they are convinced of the evil and danger of their course, and awakened to consideration, and melted into sorrow and repentance, and perhaps exercised with great terrors of conscience; till at length, by the grace of God, they come to a fixed purpose and resolution of forsaking

their sins and turning to God: and, after many strugglings and conflicts with their lusts and the strong bias of evil habits, this resolution, assisted by the grace of God, doth effectually prevail, and make a real Change both in the temper of their minds and the course of their lives; and, *when this is done, and not before, they are said to be regenerate.* Serm. on Galat. v. 15. serm. cix. vol. vi. p. 371, 372.

15. Bishop Horsley,

That image of God, in which Adam was created, in our Lord appeared perfect and entire: in the unspotted innocency of his life, the sanctity of his manners, and his perfect obedience to the Law of God: in the vast powers of his mind, intellectual and moral; intellectual, in his comprehension of all knowledge; moral, in his power of resisting all the allurements of vice and of encountering all the difficulties of virtue and religion.—In him, the beauty of the divine image was refulgent in its original perfection: in all the sons of Adam, it is obscured and marred in a degree to be scarce perceptible; the will depraved, the imagination debauched, the reason weak, the passions rampant! This deformity is not externally visible, nor the spiritual beauty which is its opposite: but, could the eye be turned upon the internal man, we should see the hideous shape of a will at enmity with God, a heart disregarding his Law, insensible of his goodness, fearless of his wrath, swelling with the passions of ambition, avarice, vain glory, lust. Yet this is the picture of *the unregenerated man* by the depravity consequent upon the Fall, born in iniquity and conceived in sin. Serm. serm. v. vol. i. p. 94, 95.

16. Bishop Barrington.

It cannot be from any defect of external evidence, that our modern philosophers deny or doubt the truth of Christianity. No: it is an unconsciousness of their want of a Redeemer that obstructs the light of the Gospel; it is the vanity of a disputatious temper, the hardness of an unhumbled heart, the opposing interests of a worldly spirit. In short, it is the repugnance and delusion of *an unregenerated mind* that blinds them against the plainest and most obvious conclusions. Charge to the Clergy of Durham: A. D. 1797: in Sermons, Charges, and Tracts. p. 211, 212.

There is, in our corrupt and unreformed nature, an indolence, a sloth, a reluctance to the constant and regular performance even of the ordinary duties of religion; which, to many, renders prayer a burden, and the public service of God a wearisome constraint instead of perfect freedom.—To the *regenerate Christian*, to the *new man* created in Christ Jesus to good works, created after God in righteousness and true holiness, the yoke of Christ is certainly easy, and his burden light: but, to the corrupt passions of mere animal nature, to the selfish inclinations of the *old man*, nothing can be more irksome and painful. Charge to the Clergy of Durham, A. D. 1801. Ibid. p. 297, 298.

Lest, however, the great and precious promises of God should be wrested to sinister purposes, your hearers should be sedulously taught, that, without Sanctification, there can be for them no atonement. For them, Christ will have died in vain: they will be, on the authority of St. Paul, *still in their sins;* that is, obnoxious to the curse and punishment of sin. It is true, indeed, that, whom God is willing to justify, he sanctifies; and he sanctifies whom he will: for *he hath mercy, on whom he will have mercy; and, whom he will, he hardeneth:* that is, he leaves the sinner to the natural corruption of his own heart and the unsubdued power of sin. The sinner, who is thus left, continues *in an unregenerate and unsanctified, that is, in a reprobate and lost, state.* Ibid. p. 310.

From the Scriptures we must collect, what human nature was at first, and what it soon became. From the world at present, and from our own hearts, we must learn, what it is now. A serious and impartial study of human nature, as exhibited in the Scriptures, the world and ourselves, will lead to the same unavoidable conviction, and shew what our nature became, when left to itself, when turned from God to the world, from light to darkness, from holy obedience to earthly and sensual appetites. Upon this foundation may be built those humiliating considerations, which are most in consonance with the end of our Saviour's incarnation: and, in this view, it will not be difficult to convince an unhardened mind, that the heart of the disobedient can never be turned to the wisdom of the just, and restored to the image of the divine goodness in

which it was created, but by repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. In a state of sincere repentance and true faith, the mind has acquired that Newness of spirit and Rectitude of heart, which constitutes the *New Birth*, and which is the source of every spiritual comfort here and of all our hopes hereafter. Ibid. p. 311, 312.

II. I shall now subjoin a few remarks on the preceding extracts.

1. It will readily be perceived: that the Doctrinal System, maintained by this *Catena Theologorum*, is the same as that, which, under the aspect of its speaking the Sense of Holy Scripture as Holy Scripture was understood by the Primitive Church, is set forth in the present Treatise. Baptism is admitted to be *an* appointed mean of Moral Regeneration: but it is denied to be the *sole* mean, as if Moral Regeneration were *invariably* communicated through Baptism and *never* through any other channel.

Now, so far from advocating any such opinion as the *Inseparability of Outward Baptism and Inward Regeneration*, the Divines before us view the *Word of God preached and enforced upon the conscience;* as *another* and (what one of them calls) *the great mean* which is appointed for our Regeneration: and Dr. Whitby, whose statement perfectly corresponds with theirs, advances even to the length of saying, that *The Word of God is the* ORDINARY *mean of our New Birth.* Whitby's Comment on 1 Peter i. 23. See above, book ii. chap. 2. § II. 3. note.

Accordingly, they take up the precise line of argument, proposed by St. John and from that Apostle avowedly followed out by Augustine: namely, that we must determine ourselves to be morally regenerate or morally unregenerate, not from the mere fact of our having been baptised or our not having been baptised, but from the evidence afforded by the spiritual state of our minds and by our corresponding practice; a mode of reasoning, which, as a matter of course, inevitably supposes and assumes, that *Baptism is in no wise the* SOLE *channel through which Moral Regeneration is communicated.*

2. With only one of these Divines, and *that* so far as *Rationalè* or *Principle* is concerned, I find myself unable to agree.

Like Archbishop Usher, I certainly believe: that, *In the case of baptised Infants, the Inward Grace of Baptism does not* ALWAYS *attend upon the Outward Sign.* But I do not believe it on the precise ground taken up by him: namely, *The dogma of Calvinistic Election.* With good Bishop Hall, I would rather say: that *The Spirit, which works by means, will not be tied to means.* Whence I conclude: that, *Although, in various instances, Children, juxta modum recipientium, are morally regenerated in and through Baptism; yet in various instances likewise, God is pleased to shew the mighty efficacy, either of his Revealed Word, or of a Devout Belief in Christ through whatever instrument produced, by morally regenerating, through one or the other of these two additional scriptural channels, those whom he had not seen good to regenerate through the medium of Infant Baptism.* On the basis of historical testimony, as I have fully shewn in my Treatise on *The Primitive Doctrine of Election*, I am quite satisfied of the erroneousness of the Calvinistic System: nor do I perceive the least necessity of calling it in, with Archbishop Usher, to account for a fact, which nevertheless, *as* a fact, I suppose to be indisputable.

To prevent any misapprehension, as to what some have alleged respecting a pretended *necessary* connection of the Doctrine of Baptismal Separability with the untenable Scheme of Calvinism, thus bringing out the result that the acknowledged untenability of the one involves the untenability of the other, I have thought it right to enter this explanatory protest. It is a very great mistake to say: that *A Denial of the* UNIVERSAL *Regeneration of Infants requires, by a logical necessity, the Adoption of the Calvinistic Theory.* The two, no doubt, *may* be connected, as Archbishop Usher connects them: but the two have no *dialectically necessary* connection.

THE END.

GEN. THEO. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

PRINTED BY L. AND G. SEELEY, THAMES DITTON, SURREY.

DATE DUE

JAN 4 '79

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

234.4J
F112

AUTHOR
Faber

TITLE
Primitive doctrine of regenera-
tion

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
	GXXXTXXXS	DEC 2 '77

234.4 J
F 112